

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. XXI.

JULY, 1917.

No. 3.

---

## WHY DO CATHOLICS ACCEPT THE DEITY OF CHRIST?

During the last two weeks of the Sunday campaign in Boston a small tract, or pamphlet, was distributed by mail, apparently by courtesy of the "Massachusetts State Council, K. of C.," since it was published by them, as stated on the title page. The tract is entitled "The Divinity of Christ," with the further information: "One of a Series of Lectures on the Fundamentals of Faith, Delivered in the Brooklyn Academy of Music before the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, by Rev. Walter Drum, S. J., Professor of Scripture, Woodstock College. Imprimi Potest: A. J. Maas, S. J., Praep. Prov." On the second page we read: "Nihil Obstat: Patrick J. Waters, Ph. D., Censor Librorum." Below this: "Imprimatur: William, Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston. November 2, 1916." The tract is officially censored and sanctioned, as you see. From a footnote on page three we gather that this lecture was delivered in December, 1915.

Naturally, the tract was read from cover to cover to ascertain if perchance there might be something new under the Jesuit luminary. But herein we were disappointed, which was to be expected. It is the same sleight-of-hand performance that these Jesuits, those brilliant logicians, have always practised to the confusion of their audiences. On receipt of the tract one was led to speculate, too, why these courteous Knights of Columbus distributed this tract at this particular time. Perhaps it was "Billy" Sunday's fervent and enthusi-

astic insistence on the doctrine of the divinity of Christ as a primary doctrine of the Christian religion, for which he brought proof, why his audiences should accept it, from the Word of God, inerrant and infallible. This tract seems to be a silent instruction to the faithful by the cardinal that Roman Catholics do not believe in the divinity of Christ because the *Bible* says so, but because the Roman Catholic *Church* says so. One has a vague suspicion that this circumstance prompted these Knights of Columbus to send out that tract at that time, for "Billy" Sunday was insisting valiantly on the divinity of Christ at that time. This Jesuit manipulates his subject in a very ingenious manner. We shall attempt to give a short *résumé* of the tract. Bear in mind throughout that the Jesuit is speaking of the divinity of Christ, at least that is the title of his address.

The author first treats of the "early heresies" respecting the divinity of Christ. Quite naturally, by the way, he uses the question of our Lord, "What think ye of Christ?" as a sort of text. "The answer of the traditional school" (by this he means the "Catholic School of Theology") "is this: He is very God and very Man." Our Lutheran Church has claimed that as the Scriptural answer to that question. But the author does not claim that this doctrine is Scriptural; he does not take the "Word of God as proof for it, as you will presently see.

In referring to "early heresies" he speaks of Arius, of Nestorius, of Eutyches, of the three patriarchs of the Orient: Sergius of Constantinople, Cyrus of Alexandria, Athanasius of Antioch, and of Photius. There is nothing to criticise in his presentation of these heresies as far as one can see. But what attracts one's attention in this connection is the manner in which he speaks of the councils at which these heresies were discussed and the orthodox, Christian doctrine defined. He speaks of "the *infallible* declaration of the *Church* in the Council of Nicaea, 325"; "the *infallible Church*, which in the Council of Ephesus (431 A. D.); "the *infallible*

Council of Chalcedon (451 A. D.).” But when he comes to the council which dealt with the heresy of the three patriarchs, he speaks of “the Council of Constantinople (680 A. D.).” He omits the “infallibility” there. Why? Is it because this council condemned the heresy of Honorius, the Roman bishop, and because the “infallible” Leo II hurled anathema at, and denounced, this his “infallible” predecessor?! It would seem, unless it was an accidental omission, that the author was in doubt regarding the complete infallibility of this council and omitted the designation. His audience would not notice the omission anyway.

The next chapter in the tract draws our interest, since in it the author intends to bring the proof for the divinity of Christ. To the question why he believes in the divinity of Christ he replies: “I believe in the divinity of Christ on the authority of God revealing.” You will note that phrase “God revealing.” When we have come to the end of the tract, you will probably discover what he means by that term. At this point he goes through three steps of reasoning.

*First Step:* “The motive of divine faith is only the authority of God revealing,” not the authority of man. “Infallible though the authority of the Catholic Church be in teaching of faith and morals, it is not the motive of divine faith. . . . We believe in the divinity of Christ because God reveals that truth to us.” Note here that he has introduced the “infallible authority of the Catholic Church.”

*Second Step:* “But how do you know that God reveals to us the divinity of Christ?” —he asks himself the question. Answer: “Because the Church teaches me that God reveals the divinity of Christ.” You notice that the “infallible authority of the Catholic Church” is being pushed into the foreground.

*Third Step:* “But the Church may err when she teaches that God reveals the divinity of Christ.” Answer: “The Church may not err in faith and morals, because she is infallible in faith and morals.” Adroitly the scene has been

shifted! While "God revealing" moves into the background, the "infallibility of the Church" moves into the foreground.

The sum and substance of this reasoning process is that it will be necessary to prove the infallibility of the Church as the rule of faith and morals, in order to be able to prove that Christ is "very God and very Man." In other words: Seek ye first the infallibility of the Church, and the divinity of Christ will be added thereunto! But what about the Word of God as revealed in the Bible? Is not this the first source of knowledge for this doctrine? So we believe, but not the Jesuit. Hear his judgment of this one and only source of every doctrine of the entire Christian religion: "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible—with no support or stay, dangling in the air—is no rule of faith whatsoever. For a rule is fixed in its measure; and the unsupported Bible is made by Protestant Biblical scholars to be adaptable to any measure you please. . . . Among Catholic theologians, things are altogether different. The infallible Church is a fixed rule of faith." How ingenious! Since "a rule is fixed in its measure," the Bible, in order to be a rule of faith, must be fixed by the "infallible Catholic Church," and no one may believe anything that the Bible teaches unless the Church permits him to believe it. The Jesuit says that the Church teaches that God reveals things in the Bible. But you must not take God's Word for the things He tells us there. You must let the Church lead you through the intricacies of His Word. And whatever the Church says is all right you may believe. In this manner our brilliant scene-shifter has pushed the authority of the Word of God out of sight, and you are now staring at the "infallibility of the Catholic Church," which is over and above the Bible. In fact, there was no Bible when the infallibility of the Church was established!

He says: "The Bible, the collection of books which Luther set up as the be-all and end-all of the teachings of Christ, the sole depository of revealed truth,—this Bible was not in existence until the year 220 of our era. True, the separate

books existed before that time. But the separate, disunited books were not the Bible, until some authority outside of each book brought them all together into one authoritative collection." And who was that "authority outside of each book"? Just follow the subtle argument of the Jesuit! "The separated and disunited books did not exist until after the Church began to be. The Church began to be during the lifetime of Christ; it was completed in its foundation by the time of His ascension, about 29 A. D." However, all scholars agree that the Gospel of Matthew did not exist before 45 A. D., and that of John belongs to the period of 100—110 A. D. Therefore, "there is no Bible on which to found our acceptance of the divinity of Christ"; — therefore, "unless the Church give me the Bible, and tell me that the Bible teaches the divinity of Christ, I have no proof on which to ground my faith in this fundamental doctrine." Consequently this doctrine is a part of the Christian creed by grace of the Roman Catholic Church! And if the Church chose to tell the faithful that the Bible did not teach such a doctrine, the faithful were bound to believe this, because the Church brought these separate and disunited books into an authoritative collection, and by doing so originated the Bible. And the Church is infallible, while the Bible is not!

Throughout the next pages of his argument the Jesuit undertakes to show how the Church existed before the Bible. The Bible in this argument is reduced and discredited beyond recognition, whilst the infallibility of the Church arises out of the débris of this demolition with a luster that is startling. But let us follow him briefly in this action.

Under the heading "Only Historical Evidence" the author tries to prove that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John "are historical documents, worthy of acceptance by a prudent man as narratives of facts, and not of fiction." However, "we do not assume these documents as part of the Bible; there is as yet no Bible. We do not give these documents any divine authority." No, they are mere "human documents"; and later he places them alongside Caesar, Livy, Thucydides,

Demosthenes, Sophocles, Plato, etc. He uses three tests in this connection to establish the "historical worth" of these "human documents," viz., text evidence, evidence of versions, evidence of use in other trustworthy sources.

*First Test: Text Evidence.*—"We have 2,467 Greek manuscripts of the original text of these four documents which trace the text back to about A. D. 350." He refers in this connection to the Sinaitic and the Vatican manuscripts as being the oldest, for all scholars agree that they were written about that time, A. D. 350, or 240 years after John wrote. But our author leads us back further by a clever invention. In comparing the two oldest manuscripts, the Sinaitic and the Vatican, it appears that, "although they agree substantially," they contain "minor differences, which cannot have taken place in less than a generation,—say thirty years." Strikes us as a rather short generation! But never mind that; it brings us down to the year 320, and there is where we stop with the text evidence.

*Second Test: Evidence of Versions.*—Here we have 8,000 versions to work with. Of these St. Jerome's Latin version of the four documents dates from the year 383. That sets us back a peg, but merely to take a bigger jump. Jerome's Latin version was a revision of the Old Latin version. Here we make a big discovery. This old Latin version "was carefully used by St. Cyprian in the middle of the third century, by Tertullian in A. D. 181—189, by the Scillitan martyrs of Carthage in A. D. 180." This brings us down to the year 150, or about forty years after John's death; for you must allow at least thirty years of use up to the time of these martyrs. So one guesses anyway, because there is no demonstration by the author how he gets to the year 150 from the year 180, unless he subtracts a generation's use.

But the year 150 is not yet our limit. "Now compare the second-century text of the Latin Church (Old Latin

version) with the fourth-century text of the Byzantine Church" (the Sinaitic Greek text, most likely). By this process we arrive at the year 135. How does he get there? By way of "substantial agreement," and "accidental differences," and by calling on the Syrian Church for aid, "which translated these four documents into Syriac about the year 150 of our era." Then, though these translations from the original Greek agree substantially, "they disagree in accidental matters." "To explain the accidental differences we must allow at least fifteen years." But among the Greek manuscripts he allowed thirty years for such differences! Why fifteen here? The author does not tell us. Perhaps he was afraid that his calculations would bring the writing of these four documents within the lifetime of Christ. That would be disastrous to this Jesuit's invention for proving that the Church was before the Bible. Anyway, with the subtraction of the above fifteen years allowed for these discrepancies, we arrive at the year 135, or within twenty years of John's death. But our author takes us down another step. You see, the Old Latin and Syriac versions "agree in many accidentals in which they disagree from the Greek text Aleph B, a text that we have tracked down to A. D. 320." Consequently, there must have been "an archetype Greek text at least fifteen years earlier than the previous text." Subtract 15 from 135, and you will have the year 120, or ten years after the death of John. From that period onward "the text of the four Gospels was admitted to be historical by the Church substantially as the text now is." *Quod erat demonstrandum!*

*Third Test: Evidence of Patristic Use.*—"It would take too long to give the third class of evidence of this historic acceptance. Suffice it to say that our three documents of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are used as authoritative by St. Clement of Rome, A. D. 93—95; St. Ignatius of Antioch, A. D. 110—117; St. Polycarp of Smyrna, about A. D. 117." He also cites a few other fathers of a later period. He feels

that he has sufficiently established the historical worth of the four documents by the two previous tests. And we feel relieved that he has cut it short.

It is not necessary to go into detail about the next chapter. He there contrasts the four Gospels with profane documents, as Caesar, Livy, Demosthenes, Plato, Sophocles, Euripides, Horace, Lucretius, etc., and points out dramatically that no one doubts the authenticity of these classics. "Now, no prudent man ever thinks of denying these profane works to the authors they are assigned to. . . . Therefore, in the name of sanity and prudence, no man has the right to deny the historical worth in substance of these four documents. There is *the first step in our proof of the infallibility of the Church.*" (Italics ours.)

But what about proof for the doctrine of the divinity of Christ? Oh, as far as we see, that is only blind to display the beauty of the dogma of the infallibility of the Church. Every Jesuit's hobby is this dogma. And did he not tell us that one first had to prove the infallibility of the Church, in order to be able to establish the doctrine of the divinity of Christ? Well, he is on his way.

After having "proved" the historical worth of these four Gospels, which, as you will remember, are mere "human documents," he continues to give an outline of the facts contained in these documents. It is very, very meager information which they offer. Give attention!

First: They contain information about "an historical person named Jesus, . . . who had a message from God the Father to give to all the world."

Secondly: This Jesus "prophesied His resurrection; and appealed to the resurrection in proof of the truth of His claim that He was the Ambassador of God the Father," from whom He had a message for the world.

Thirdly: "He arose from the dead to fulfil His prophecy in proof of the truth of His claim to the divine ambassador-

ship, to the message from the Father, and to the right to give that message to the world." Our author speaks about a "message," but he never tells us what this message really contained. He seems loath to tell it; instead, he takes a healthy swing at higher criticism, and annihilates it with Jesuitical scorn. While going through these mental acrobatics, you marvel and forget all about the contents of that "message."

Finally: "Both before and after His resurrection, Jesus consigned . . . that message unto a teaching body, which He said was Infallible, Indefectible, One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Petrine."

Note that peculiar term "teaching body." From this point to the end he operates with that term. He states that Jesus consigned His message from the Father to a "body of living teachers"; to this "teaching body" He gave the right to hand down this message to all the world; and to this "teaching body" He gave the qualities above-mentioned. You cannot escape the author's intention in introducing this term. He plants this term in the minds of his listeners, and by his frequent use of it, it becomes an established thing.

Regarding the qualities of this "teaching body," he asks the question, "How shall we establish these qualities that belong to the living teaching body which Jesus gave to the world?"

First, "The teaching body is infallible."—"To prove this essential attribute of Christ's teaching body, the following facts, given by Matthew and Mark, are of paramount importance":—

Just before His ascension Jesus said to His eleven apostles: "All power hath been given Me in heaven and upon earth. Therefore go ye, make disciples of all nations, baptize them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And, lo, I am with you all days, even to the end of the world." (Author's own translation from the original Greek.)

Again, while ascending, Jesus "gave this solemn message to the same body of teachers: 'Go ye to all the world, preach the Gospel to all creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be damned.'"

Now let us see the deductions. "All power hath been given Me in heaven and upon earth," says Jesus. "Something most important is to follow," says Jesuit Drum. "The faith of the world will be put to the test. Therefore the world is told that 'all power is Christ's.' *With this all-power He proceeds to make His living body of teachers to be infallible.*" (Italics ours.)

Among the duties which Jesus imposed upon this "teaching body" there is one which is of paramount importance, says our author, *viz.*, "Teach them (after baptism) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." And since the Lord adds: "Lo, I am with you all days, even to the end of the world,"—"He, the Ambassador of the Father, will ever be at hand to prevent them from error. They will be infallible in this teaching. . . . Moreover, Christ made acceptance of the message of that teaching body the condition of salvation, and rejection of that teaching the condition of damnation." Proof: "He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." (The words "and is baptized" are omitted by the author at this place.) "If that teaching body could err in handing down His message, denial of His message would be a condition of salvation, and acceptance of His message would be a condition of damnation. That were impossible, unspeakable. . . . Therefore, He made that teaching body infallible." As lucid as mud, as far as we can see!

Secondly, "Jesus made that teaching body to be indefectible." As proof for this quality he brings these words of our Lord: "Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I shall build My Church, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it." To which the author adds: "The gates of hell shall never prevail against that teaching body: it is in-

defectible." To drive home this argument, the author here introduces a pious story of the boyhood days of Newman. "Mother, what Church is the oldest Church?" "Oh, the Roman Catholic Church is the oldest Church." "And why is the Roman Catholic Church not the true Church?" "Because it left the truth in the fifth century." "Oh, then, mother, the gates of hell prevailed against it, didn't they?" Oh, no; "the gates of hell shall not prevail against that Church," exclaims the author. *Quod erat demonstrandum!*

This completes the establishment of these two qualities, which are "so essential that they are called the attributes of this teaching body." He then proceeds to discuss the remaining qualities, which are called "notes,—marks that are visible characteristics of this teaching body."

The first mark: "The teaching body is One." Why? "Christ did not say, 'Go, follow Henry the Eighth when he throws over the jurisdiction of the pope'; and at the same time contradict Himself and say, 'Go follow the Pope of Rome.'" (Christ said, of course, "Follow the Pope of Rome!") Hence, "that teaching body must be one in jurisdiction." Again, "Christ did not say, 'Follow the New York Presbytery; deny the virgin birth of Jesus; deny the physical resurrection of the Savior'; and at the same time contradict Himself by saying: '*Be a Catholic*; believe in the virgin birth and the resurrection.'" (Italics ours.) Hence, "that teaching body must be one in doctrine, because its doctrine is the message from the Father unto Christ." Hence, the teaching body must be one in jurisdiction and one in doctrine. He loses many words over the unity in doctrine, but about the "jurisdiction" he merely makes the plain statement.

The second mark: "The teaching body must be holy." Why? "Because it is founded by Christ to teach His doctrines, and only His doctrines. Those doctrines must be holy." And because it is holy, it "cannot deny the miracles of the Lord, cannot degrade the Lord to the low grade of a dupe,—as do the Anglican clergyman Lake of Harvard, the Lutheran

clergyman Schweitzer of Strassburg, and others." Wherever he can drag in Luther or a Lutheran, he makes it a point to do so.

The third mark: "The teaching body must be Catholic." Why? "Go teach *all* nations!" "I will be with you *all* days!" Note this: "It is not founded in 1520 by Luther, for some Germans; not founded in 1534, by Henry VIII, for England; not founded in 1560 by John Knox, for Scotland; not founded in 1606 by John Smith, for scores of kinds of Baptists; not founded in 1739 by John Wesley, for scores of kinds of Methodists. No, ten thousand times, no! That teaching body is founded by Christ for all times and all nations." How dramatic and what holy Jesuitical zeal! And the year 1520? Luther never had the intention of founding a Lutheran Church, and protested vehemently against his followers calling themselves Lutherans. What Luther did do was to annihilate that damnable "teaching body" by casting it down from its arrogated throne, and placing the Word of God where it belonged, and where God would have it be, in the hearts of His people.

The fourth mark: "The teaching body must be apostolic, founded on the Apostles." But the author hastens to modify the expression "founded on the Apostles" by saying, "That teaching body must be Petrine, founded on Peter." This "supplements the mark of apostolicity." Proof? Those words of the Lord when He "rewarded the faith of Simon, Son of John, by setting him as foundation stone to the apostolic body of teachers: 'Thou art Kefa.' He did not say, 'Thou art Peter.' He said, 'Thou art Kefa,' which means a *rock*, 'and upon this Kefa, this rock, I shall build My Church.' . . . This is the only sane, germane interpretation of these words. The new name Kefa, given to Simon, meant rock; for he was to be made the rock on which this teaching body was builded by the Christ. . . . That teaching body must be built on Kefa, on the Rock, on Peter, *not on the Bible! There was no Bible to build on until nearly two hundred years later, and then the Bible was given out by the Petrine teaching body.*" (Italics

ours.) However, according to this logic Peter never erred, he never fell. Peter's denial, for instance, occurred after he had been made the "foundation stone to the apostolic body of teachers." How do you explain that according to this Jesuitical reasoning? After Christ's ascension he also erred, for which Paul took him severely to task. Peter thus was fallible in his infallibility!

And the Bible? We have the Bible by grace of this "teaching body," which of course is the Roman Catholic Church. The "Bible was given out by the Petrine teaching body," and since the Pope is the successor of Peter, we have the Bible by grace of the Pope of Rome. It is not the inspired Word of God until the Pope says so, and whatever he admits of being thus inspired.

After having thus delineated the "teaching body," Jesuit Drum says: "Now find that teaching body. It is indefectible! It must exist to-day! Is there any teaching body to-day that dares claim these essential attributes, and these four marks, especially the last, the Petrine? . . . There is only one Church that ever dared, or will ever dare, claim to be such, and that is the Catholic teaching body." You will recall that we called your attention to the insidious manner in which the term "teaching body" was introduced into the argument. You now see that our author has arrived at the point where he says that this "body of teachers" is the Roman Catholic Church, which means the Pope, since he as successor of Peter is the "foundation stone" of this "teaching body." And since the Church is not apostolic unless it is Petrine, the message which Christ gave to the Church is given to the Pope.

But where, one may ask, is there in all this the proof for the divinity of Christ? Well, do you not see? The teaching body is infallible, indefectible, one, holy, catholic, apostolic = Petrine, therefore Christ is very God and very Man! *Quod erat demonstrandum*. That is as clear as the Missouri River. Any one can see that! If you have followed this Jesuit line of argument to the end, you most likely find yourself "dangling

in the air," attached to a balloon of Jesuitry. The best thing to do is to take the two-edged sword of the Word of God and cut the rope.

This tract is a fair sample of the modern way of robbing the people of the sure Word of God. These Jesuits are going up and down the land and fooling the people with their sleight-of-hand performances, making fools of their audiences, and casting thousands into damnation. By their adroit scene-shifting they slip the Word of God out of sight, and push the fiction and fraud of an infallibility in its place. These are the arts and sciences of the devil, who stalks about in the garb of these Jesuits, and dupes thousands into eternal damnation.

"The Word they still shall let remain, and not a thank have for it." Indeed, the Word of God, the whole Word, and nothing but the Word of God, is good enough for us. That Word must be preached, and that Word is the foundation of our Christian faith. There we learn all that is necessary for our faith and salvation. If a Jesuit—and all his crew—prefers to prance around on the covers of that Bible, he may have the Satanic pleasure, though it must grieve every honest and good Bible Christian to witness so many thousands being led into hell by his antics. Lutheran Christians will prefer to wade right into the ocean of proof for the divinity of Christ in the Bible, and there learn what God Himself says of His Son, that He is our Savior, who became our Brother in the flesh and died for the whole world, for our sins, upon the cross as very God and very Man, and commanded us to preach Him, and Him only, to the salvation of the souls of many. Our teaching body is the Word of God, and the foundation stone to this teaching body is Jesus Christ Himself.

Boston, Mass.

G. E. HAGEMAN.

---

## LUTHER AND ZWINGLI.

## A PARALLEL AND A CONTRAST.

## 8.

Luther and Zwingli both entered the humanistic circles and found permanent friends there: Zwingli's lifelong friendship with Capito, Jud, and Pellican was formed at Basel; Luther gained Spalatin and Lang for abiding friends, not to mention others with whom his connection was less strong. But while Zwingli was drawn into the humanistic circles by his whole previous training, and while he found his most congenial world there, Luther maintained a deprecating, critical attitude to the humanistic movement. He did not prudishly separate himself from the genial and spirited young men whom he found in these circles, he entered into their literary work, and bore his share in the lively conversation, but could not attune his spirit to the lighter moods which predominated in this society. There was a serious strain in all that he said, a searching for deeper things. Humanism was to Luther but a passing phenomenon, acceptable as an incentive, good as a means to an end, but not the end itself.

Both Luther and Zwingli had their attention directed to the Bible during their university days. Zwingli must have received the impulse to the Bible-study which he began in earnest during his pastorate at Glarus while listening to Wyttenbach. We do not know whether or to what extent he began to acquaint himself, while at Basel, with the Book which Wyttenbach had declared the norm of doctrine and faith. Nor do we know at what time Luther found the complete Bible at the university library in Erfurt. But we do know that the effect of what he read was immediate upon Luther. It was never shaken off; the power of the Word, though he still was in no position to grasp its lessons, laid hold upon his soul, and the Bible henceforth became the inseparable companion of Luther. Before the demands which this book made upon him, everything else soon receded into the background.

## 9.

Luther's initiation into the Augustinian order of monks is an event of such far-reaching importance in the development of his character, and the difference between him and Zwingli is so strongly revealed by this act, that it is worth the trouble to scrutinize the impulses leading to this act somewhat more closely. Luther's inner life received no nourishment from his studies. The intricate questions which his teachers discussed before their classes did not touch the matter of supreme interest to Luther, *viz.*, How can I be rid of sin, of the feeling of guilt, and how can I attain to assurance that I have the favor of God? These incessant questionings of the spirit within him have been interpreted as remorse over his youthful dissipations in the gay student-life of the university town; but there is no warrant for this interpretation. Luther's life was morally clean; he loathed those students who "pursued two kinds of lectures with the greatest zest: those with King Gambrinus and with Knight Tannhaeuser." He was scandalized by a fellow-student who threw down his book with disgust after a half-hour's futile attempt to rivet his attention on the subject, and declared study only tended to make a person stupid. There is no record of Luther engaging in the composition of light poetry and in the frivolities of many at his age. His spiritual condition is plainly that restless feeling which in all ages has been discovered in the searchers after God. In the midst of a cheerful conversation the thought of God and eternity would seize him, and the vanity of this earthly life and the emptiness of its glories would be revealed to him as by a flash of lightning. Even the honors accorded to him at his promotion to the Master's degree could only temporarily check these somber ruminations of his mind. At a later period in his life he relates that, when a young man, he had despaired of his salvation. He was tempted to blaspheme God. All his self-discipline, strict observance of the rules of the Church, and pious practises failed to give him the feeling of satisfaction with himself which he craved. Washing his hands with others, he remarked: "The more we wash, the

more unclean we become." He was hungering and thirsting for comfort, but there was no one to minister it to him. When, after Epiphany 1505, he took up the study of jurisprudence because his father wished to make him a great counselor at Mansfeld, the feeling of dissatisfaction was only increased. The study seemed extremely shallow and selfish to him. The sudden death of a fellow-student overwhelms him with most gloomy thoughts. "To-day you are gone, to-morrow I may join you"—he reflects. He meets a Carthusian, prematurely aged with fasting and penances, hobbling along on crutches. Instead of repelling, the sight really attracts him; he thinks this life might be the road to inward peace. And when God seems to speak to him out of the whirlwind and the lightning, the agonized soul seeks relief in the vow to enter the monk's life, to flee from the world, to cast aside all his former associations, and yield himself entirely to God.

### 10.

Luther's entering the cloister of the Augustinian Hermits at Erfurt has been called a "sudden decision" and an "abrupt vow." (Preserved Smith, p. 8.) It came, indeed, as a shock to Luther's father and Luther's friends. Luther himself connects his final resolution to become a monk with the terror that seized him during the thunderstorm near Stotterheim on July 2, as he was returning to Erfurt from a visit at Mansfeld. Still, Luther may be said to have been fully prepared for that very action. From his childhood Christianity had been represented to him, not as the religion of salvation, of reconciliation with God through Christ, but as the religion of the anger of God, which must be appeased by man's own works, and of the just retribution which Jesus, the Judge of all the earth, would mete out to all who would face Him in the nakedness of their sinful self, unprotected by the merits and intercession of the saints. Luther had, moreover, thoroughly embraced the view which the Roman Church holds of the "world." Every secular pursuit becomes in this view essentially unholy, an

obstacle to true holiness, a drawing away from God. Luther observed that his studies, the future which his father had planned for him, had this tendency to make him "worldly." That thought alone must have been unbearable to a sensitive soul like his, that was earnestly striving for salvation. Add to this that Luther had unconsciously received incentives to choose the monastic life at Magdeburg, Eisenach, and cloister-ridden Erfurt, the "little Rome" of Germany, by observing, and conversing with, monks and priests, and his sudden decision becomes the logical conclusion of an erring conscience.

It is not improbable that Luther's visit at Mansfeld during the latter part of June had been undertaken for the purpose of obtaining his father's consent to quit the study of jurisprudence. The lectures in that Faculty had begun May 19, and there is no apparent reason except his utter disgust that explains Luther's interruption of his studies about the middle of June. The possibility of his becoming monk may have been touched upon in this conversation with his father. In the letter of apology to his father which Luther published in 1521, in connection with his treatise "On Spiritual and Monastic Vows," Luther refers to his father's intentions concerning a favorable marriage for him, and other plans, which would be thwarted by his entering the cloister, also to the well-grounded scruples of his father regarding the wisdom of a healthy young man of twenty-two years choosing the state of celibacy. It is not likely that these matters were discussed in writing between father and son, and if they were discussed orally, the only occasion would be this visit. Luther was too dutiful a son to undertake such a decisive action altogether without his father's knowledge, though he was aware, when he took the fatal step, that he acted against his father's wish, and that he must now endeavor to change his father's mind.

With the conflict of spiritual and secular interests raging in his heart, Luther must have traveled through the beautiful summer-landscapes of Thuringia in those days in July. What a dualism, he may have thought, does man carry about in his

bosom! Here is this great world, teeming with life, resounding with mirth and joy, beckoning to high hopes. Here are friends, dear relatives, happy and contented with their lot. Here is freedom of choice and action and development. Can I surrender my place and share in all this? Yonder are the somber walls of a retreat that looks like a tomb, and is a tomb to all that is naturally alive in man. There is sighing and melancholy and penitential tears and unquestioning obedience to the will of another who determines one's every choice. Can I submit to all this? But then came the thought that had so often knocked for admission before: God is there; His presence is felt there as nowhere else. Brighter prospects pointing beyond the clouds are there, and glimpses of the future glory. Is the sacrifice of present blessings at all comparable to the soul-uptift and the sense of self-satisfaction that must come when once you enter that sacred solitude? Ah, "when I enter the cloister and stand before God in cap and cowl, He will hail me with delight and reward me." The aged Luther remembers such thoughts coursing in his mind at this time.

Nor must the fact be overlooked that fourteen days passed after the unformed resolve in Luther's heart rose to his lips in that cry to St. Anna, which was wrested from him while the thunder-peals rolled over his head. That is not a long time, but it is a sufficient time for thorough reflection and, if necessary, for revision. "I have promised," he must have said to himself on rising and retiring every day during those two weeks. Hardly an hour can have passed during those fourteen days but that the *pros* and *cons* of his contemplated action were being weighed. There were moments when he almost repented. The vow which, after incubation through many months of agonized self-scrutiny, had burst its confinement in the tempest, had now become a recognized reality in Luther's inner life. It tenanted his heart; it sat down to meat with him; it walked through the streets with him, and he held converse with it, and saw it grow and become firm, so firm that it could not be shaken any more by the pleading of his dearest

friends. For we can well imagine that Luther's announcement of his purpose to the little farewell party which gathered about him on the evening of July 16 was not received complacently. Crotus Rubeanus has told what sadness settled on the little company when they heard why Luther had invited them. They dissented from him with one accord; his arguments about the beauty of the solitary hermit life they met with the popular views which scorned monks as lazy and unprofitable men in the hypocritical garb of saints. If Luther's resolution had not had time to mature and gather about it the necessary moral strength of an unalterable conviction, it would have been broken down that night and the next morning when the little company went weeping with him to the cloister-gate, and returned for days after looking wistfully into the cloister-yard to catch a glimpse of their comrade and urge him to come back to them. It was of no avail; Luther had courageously taken the plunge into the mysterious existence behind those solemn walls; but his was the courage of despair. Despair makes monks, he said later when he had acted the tragedy of monasticism to the end and had sounded the depths of many a monk's soul.

## 11.

A reviewer of Zwingli's<sup>5)</sup> life-work says of the subject of his study at an even later period: "Of deep personal religion Zwingli at this stage was ignorant." The writer refers to the spiritual condition of Zwingli during his first pastorate at Glarus. If such was his state of mind then, we may imagine how lightly the young and gay student wore his religion. If the old saying, *Oratio, meditatio, tentatio faciunt theologum*, is applied to the subjects of our parallel study, we are bound to expect from Luther the truer approach to the mind of God in the Scripture. While Zwingli is attracting attention and gathering fame as a bright scholar, a skilled musician, an able instructor in the classics, Luther wrestles with the problem of

---

5) Rev. J. P. Whitney, M. A., King's College, Lennoxville, Quebec, in *Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. 2: "The Reformation," p. 307.

human guilt at the tribunal of God, and its removal. Luther seeks to bury himself in the monastery, his spirit cowed and his heart crushed, while Zwingli puts his foot on the first rung of the ladder of national fame when he goes to Glarus.

Glarus lies about seven miles to the south of Wesen, where Zwingli had spent his boyhood days at his uncle's parsonage. The river Linth flows by it, touching Lake Walenstadt, near Wesen, and then running on till it empties into Lake Zurich. Though all Switzerland is mountainous, there is a lower plateau running straight across it from the Jura Mountains eastward. Glarus lies in the furthest eastern corner of this plateau. Lofty mountains encircle it on the northern, eastern, and southern side.

The Glarus parish, embracing, besides the town of Glarus with the cantonal government, the villages of Mitloedi, Ennenda, and Natstall, was an important and extensive charge. It had been vacated by one Johannes Stucki. How Zwingli was induced to seek this pastorate we do not know. Possibly his uncle suggested it to him. When he left Basel, he was holding a benefice in St. Peter's Church, probably for teaching in the school attached to St. Martin's Church. This benefice entailed other duties which may have been purely formal, but which Zwingli had neglected. This neglect involved him in trouble later with the papal Nuncio Pucci, who wanted to excommunicate him. The matter was quietly settled by Zwingli's friends at the University of Basel.

Zwingli had to purchase the parish of Glarus from a "courtesan" of Pope Julius II by the name of Heinrich Goeldli, a young aristocrat of Zurich and a speculator in church-livings. The simoniacal conditions prevailing in the church of Switzerland at that time are illustrated by the peculiar transactions of Goeldli. Prof. Vincent, on the authority of Oechsli, *Urkundenbuch* II, 504, relates: "Heinrich Goeldli, a Swiss citizen, was a member of the papal guard, and was accused [before the Federal Diet] of dishonesty in his dealings in livings. He refutes the charge by showing that he had a legal title in every one of his transactions. A few of his statements

will show how these things were regarded. 'It is true, I have in time past taken up livings, and have requested them of the Pope. I serve the Pope for no other cause, nor have I any other reward or wage from the Pope, neither I nor others of His Holiness's servants, except such livings as fall vacant in the Pope's mouth, which His Holiness presents to us, every one in his own country. . . . I hope that, although I have made contracts or agreements regarding livings which I have lawfully received from His Holiness the Pope for my services over against an evil day, I have had the power and right to do so, that I may act as I please with mine own, and may gain mine own benefit and advantage.' No one ought to charge him with fraudulent dealing, for 'I have never in my life surrendered anything from which I have had profit without I have given written evidence and laid myself under written obligation, so that in case it should be disputed by anybody, and I failed to protect him with my title and at my own expense, in the holding of the living, I should be in duty bound to pay back all costs and damages, as well as all that I have received from him. In regard to the third article [of the bill of indictment], that I have sold livings in the same way that horses are sold at Zurzach, I have never in all my life sold a living or bought it in this way, for that is simony, and whoever buys and sells livings ought to be deprived of them. But I have, when I have delivered over a living, by permission of His Holiness, demanded and taken the costs to which I have been put, and also have caused a yearly pension to be allowed me out of the living, a thing which is permitted me by the Pope, and concerning which I have my bulls, letters, and seals; for this is a common custom among the clergy.' In reply to the threat of the Diet that he should be forbidden to hold any more livings in Switzerland, Goeldli hopes that his legal rights will be respected, that certain appointments will be left for him to live on, and mentions specifically several reservations which have recently cost him large sums, and for which he expects damages and reservations. 'Furthermore, the Pope

has given me the reservation of the provostship of Zurzach, so that, when the present provost, Peter Attenhofer, shall die, this provostship shall fall to me. I have also for this the letter and seal, and have paid the annates, as the first-fruits are called, to the *camera apostolica*.' Goeldli declared later that the purchase of this expectation had cost him 350 ducats. — This appeal for justice gives unconsciously the state of opinion and practise in the appointment of the clergy. The authorities were aroused by the extent of the transactions of one man, but public sentiment does not seem to have been greatly offended in general at the purchase of preferment in the Church." (Jackson, *Zwingli*, p. 29 f.)

It cost Zwingli more than a hundred gulden to satisfy Goeldli, who claimed that he held a letter of investiture from the Pope for the parish of Glarus. The congregation at Glarus appears, indeed, to have had a voice in the matter: Zwingli was "called" to Glarus, and the payment of Goeldli's claim gave no offense to the congregation. When Zwingli, ten years later, was removed from Glarus, the congregation refunded him twenty gulden of the price he had paid for the living.

However, after this transaction had been closed, Zwingli was not yet in a position to take charge of the congregation he had purchased. He was a layman, and now had to be made a priest. It would have been different if he had been in holy orders when he was called. He sought ordination as a people's priest, and obtained it probably at Constance. His first sermon was preached at Rapperswyl on Lake Zurich, and on Michaelmas Day, September 29, he read his first mass in his native village of Wildhaus.

In a matter-of-fact way Zwingli in his twenty-second year had become the spiritual guide of a prominent parish,—and "of deep personal religion he was ignorant." It is to his credit—and all his biographers mention this fact—that he took his office seriously. "Young as I was," he relates in 1523, "the priestly office filled me with more fear than joy. Because I knew and still know that the blood of the sheep who perish

through my unfaithfulness will be required at my hands, so have I ever used my office to promote peace." But he himself did not know the true pasture of the sheep of Christ. His record at Glarus is that of a very strict and industrious priest. He insisted that the public morals of his people must be above reproach, although the moral standard was not the law of God exclusively. For he allowed himself indiscretions, as we shall note later, that are incompatible with true Scriptural ethics. His parish being large, the pastoral care of it was very exacting. But he was an indefatigable worker, always moving about in, and keeping in close touch with, every part of his parish. He even added to his duties voluntarily by assuming the teaching of the classics in the town-school. But this may have been a recreation more than a labor, and may have satisfied his lifelong craving for more intimate acquaintance with the classics. While his time was well taken up with the parish duties during the first years of his pastorate, he eked out spare hours of leisure to pursue his classical studies, kept up a correspondence with learned friends of a literary bent, and kept himself informed regarding important books and treatises that were published at Basel or imported from Germany. He made a special study of the orations of Cicero, because he aimed at being a good speaker and of the writings of Horace, because he hoped to improve and embellish his style. Besides these, he began a profound study of Seneca and of the historiographers of Rome, Livy and Tacitus. The collection of anecdotes of Valerius Maximus he committed to memory almost entire, in order to enliven his preaching and entertain his audience, which liked to see the preacher digress to lighter moods during his discourse, and was apt to comment favorably on preachers who had pleased them with witty sayings and striking illustrations. Zwingli soon succeeded in winning renown as an orator.

Zwingli's studies, however, were not exclusively secular. He was also a busy student of the Bible, and this study he valued above all others. He was especially attracted by the writings of John and Paul. His studies in the church fathers

embraced Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine. A custom that he is known to have followed in later life may have begun during his Glarus pastorate: whenever he found a striking explanation of a Bible term or text in Augustine, he would note it in the margin of his New Testament. All his studies assumed a wider range when he had learned Greek, which was not until near the close of the Glarus period.

One study which had begun to attract him during his stay at Basel continued to interest Zwingli during the first years of his pastorate at Glarus; the philosophical and theological writings of Pico della Mirandola. This promising light of the learned world, who had died prematurely at the age of thirty-one in 1494, had amazed his contemporaries by challenging any and all, when he was twenty-three years old, to debate with him nine hundred theses which he proposed to maintain. The discussion was prohibited by Pope Innocent VIII, and thirteen of the theses were condemned. Zwingli had approved some of these condemned theses, and had come to be regarded as a heretic in certain circles at Basel. Which theses Zwingli defended is unknown. A rationalistic vein seems to run through all of them. They read as follows: 1. That Christ did not truly and in real presence, but only *quoad effectum*, descend to hell; 2. That a mortal sin of finite duration is not deserving of eternal, but only of temporal punishment; 3. That neither the cross of Christ, nor any image, ought to be adored in the way of worship; 4. That God cannot assume a nature of any kind whatsoever, but only a rational nature; 5. That no science affords a better assurance of the divinity of Christ than magical and cabbalistic science; 6. That, assuming the truth of the ordinary doctrine that God can take upon Himself the nature of any creature whatsoever, it is possible for the body of Christ to be present on the altar without conversion of the substance of the bread or the annihilation of "paneity" (the state of being bread); 7. That it is more rational to believe that Origen is saved than that he is damned; 8. That as no one's opinions are just such as he

wills them to be, so no one's beliefs are just such as he wills them to be; 9. That the inseparability of substance and accident may be maintained consistently with the doctrine of transubstantiation; 10. That the words, "Hoc est corpus meum," pronounced during the consecration of the bread are to be taken "materialiter" (*i. e.*, as denoting an actual fact) and not "significative" (*i. e.*, as a mere recital); 11. That the miracles of Christ are a most certain proof of His divinity, by reason not of the works themselves, but of His manner of doing them; 12. That it is more improper to say of God that He is intelligence, or intellect, than of an angel that it is a rational soul; 13. That the soul knows nothing in act and distinctly but itself. (Jackson, *Zwingli*, p. 84 f.) To what extent these views of the Italian philosopher have influenced Zwingli's teaching on the Lord's Supper and Predestination at a later period it is not easy to establish. As regards the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Zwingli himself stated to Melancthon (*Corp. Ref.*, 4, 970) that he obtained it from Erasmus. But it is not likely that the views of Pico, whom he appears to have admired, should have remained altogether without influence on Zwingli's later teaching.

A curious incident, which assumed great significance after Zwingli had begun his reformatory work at Zurich, is related by him thus: "It was while pastor at Glarus that I came across at Mollis (four miles north of Glarus) an Obsequial, *i. e.*, a book for baptismal, burial, and benediction services, which, although old, was in respect to the writing complete and unaltered; and therein stood a Latin rubric, that immediately after the infant had been baptized, 'then shall to the child be administered the sacrament of the Eucharist, including the chalice containing the blood.' . . . How long this practise was observed in the canton of Glarus I have not been able to find out, but surely it is not two hundred years since that in Mollis the Lord's Supper was administered in both kinds." (I, 246.) At the time it was made the discovery in no way disconcerted the theologian in Zwingli.

## 12.

Why Luther selected the cloister of the Augustinians in preference to any of the other nineteen cloisters of Erfurt cannot be determined. Kolde suggests several reasons: 1. His teacher, Arnoldi von Usingen, who was an Augustinian, may have suggested this fraternity to Luther; 2. the reputation of the Augustinians for strict conformity to their monkish rules and their pious zeal may have attracted him; 3. there was in this cloister a Sodality of St. Anna to whom Luther had made his vow. Luther may not have been conscious of any preference, but since he chose the order of the Augustinian Hermits in his endeavor to become holy, and this order now has a large share in Luther's spiritual development, the distinctive features of this order, if there are any, deserve some attention.

In its general principles the order did not differ from the other orders of mendicant friars, the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Carmelites. For its government Pope Alexander IV, in 1256, had laid down the Rule of St. Augustine. At the beginning of the sixteenth century it had hundred settlements in Germany. At its head was a general, stationed at Rome, and exercising practically autocratic powers. It was divided into "provinces," over each of which was a "provincial." The head of each cloister was the "prior." Since the great reform councils of the fifteenth century a cleavage had begun to form in all orders of friars between the liberal and the strict elements. In the Augustinian order those cloisters which favored the strict enforcement of monastic rules were called "the congregation of the observants." Erfurt was one of these. The German provincial Andreas Proles, who had been in office till 1503, had strongly supported the movement of the observants, and had succeeded in allying thirty of the most prominent cloisters in support of the cause. His successor, chosen at the provincial chapter at Eschwege, was Johann von Staupitz. He continued the policy of his predecessor. This policy aimed not so much at a moral-religious regeneration of the monks as at the complete observation of all the old

monastic rules down to the smallest minutiae of the conduct of a monk. The only new rule issued by Staupitz was an admonition to zealous study of the Holy Scriptures.

The Augustinians boasted no great doctor or saint of the Church, like Thomas, Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, as members of their body. Their activity was a very quiet one: they engaged in learned studies and in works of charity. Their members were trained for pastoral work. As favorite confessors and spiritual advisers they exercised a great influence among high and low. Last, not least, they were popular and effective preachers.

It is an error to assume that the order was named after Augustine because the anti-Pelagian teachings of that church-father were perpetuated by the Augustinian Hermits. Doctrinally they differed in nothing from the Roman Church of the Middle Ages. They rather surpassed the dogmaticians of the Middle Ages in teaching the sovereignty of the Pope, the necessity of human merit for salvation, the glory and plenipotentiary power of the Queen of Heaven. Their monastic cult culminated in the adoration of the Holy Virgin, whose image had to be placed in the chapter hall of every cloister. They defended the teaching of the Immaculate Conception and of the indulgences. The greatest champion of the latter error in Germany was Johann von Paltz, doctor and professor of theology in their convent at Erfurt.

The Popes had bestowed signal favors on the Augustinians. Innocent VIII, in 1490, decreed that every church in their order, even those having but one altar, should be authorized to extend the same indulgences as were obtained by visitors of the stations at Rome. Alexander VI, in 1497, ordained that for all time to come the papal sacristan must be chosen from the Augustinians. The Augustinians reciprocated the papal favors by including special prayers for the Pope in their ritual. They were regarded at Rome as the most loyal adherents of the Curia.

The two greatest cloisters of the Augustinian observants

in Germany were at Nuernberg and Erfurt. In the cloister cemetery at Erfurt was the grave of Johannes Zachariae, who had obtained the Golden Rose from the Pope for his opposition to Hus. Relics of St. Catherine were exhibited at the cloister church. To obtain the means for erecting larger buildings, and to complete the cloister library, new and liberal indulgences had been granted the cloister at Erfurt by the Cardinal Legate Raimund v. Gurk in 1504. This, then, was the society in which Luther, a few months later, sought peace for his soul.

June. Luther interrupts his study of jurisprudence and goes on a visit to Mansfeld.

July 2. During his return to Erfurt Luther vows to become a monk.

July 17. Luther enters Augustinian cloister at Erfurt.

August. Andreas Carlstadt becomes teacher of philosophy at Wittenberg.

September (?). Luther begins his novitiate.

1505 Zwingli studies classics, philosophy, and theology at Basel, and teaches at St. Martin's School.

1506 Zwingli takes his M. A. Late summer. Zwingli called to Glarus; purchases living from Goeldli.

Zwingli ordained priest at Constance (?).

September 29. Zwingli celebrates first mass at Wildhaus. Assumes charge of Glarus parish as people's priest.

Wenceslaus Link becomes teacher of philosophy at Wittenberg.

September (?). Luther received into Order of Augustinian Eremites.

Spring. Having passed through subdiaconate and diaconate, Luther is ordained priest.

May 2. Luther reads his first mass.

Trutvetter of Erfurt becomes member of theological faculty of Wittenberg.

October 18. Staupitz prevails on Augustinian Chapter to send Luther and others to teach at University of Wittenberg.

November (?). Luther becomes professor at Wittenberg.

1507

Zwingli pastor at Glarus.

1508

D.

(To be continued.)

## ERASMUS THE SATIRIST AND MORALIST.

Few things are so wholesome to all men, and specially to maturing and maturer men in the clerical office, as the study of history, its sources, documents, and deeper coherence. The instinctive hero-worship of youth and its intrinsic immaturity are well expressed in a sentence of Macrobius: "Then, when we admired, but could not judge as yet." In this year of 1917 we think much of 1517, its mighty struggles bound up with the recovery of Christian freedom and Christian truth. It is not easy for a young theologian who is rapidly losing his slender classical equipment to realize that there was a time in Europe when there was fairly no other culture than classical culture and the leaders of minds and tastes, the establishers of ideals and universally accepted canons of refinement and achievements were men who wrote Latin with idiomatic brilliancy, and abandoned scholasticism for a somewhat vague body of "Humanities." The leader of all this movement, a movement begun by Petrarch, was Erasmus of Rotterdam. At a future time I shall present some extracts from his correspondence. If he had lived in the time of Antonius, he might have done the work of Lucian, with which universal satirist he had much affinity. I am not going here to depict—it has been done a hundred times—how Erasmus as critic and satirist seemed to go into the direction of Reformation, and how he halted, and, halting, reestablished himself (in the crisis) a Romanist. It may be well here to recall his patrons, whose pensions the famous scholar, author, and oracle of his time accepted: they were all adherents of the older order. Some of them were: the bishop of Cambrai, Lord Mountjoy, Thomas More, Colet, Archbishop Wareham, Cardinal Wolsey, Henry VIII, the Marquise de Vere, Archduke Philip of Austria, John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, James IV of Scotland, Leo X (to whom he dedicated his New Testament!), the Bishop of Basle and some of its foremost citizens, Charles V and his brother Ferdinand, Frederick the Wise of Saxony, and

many others. His writings were all in Latin, and they were read in Madrid and Warsaw no less than in Rome, Florence, Venice, Louvain, Paris, London, Oxford, Heidelberg, Ingolstadt, Erfurt, Wittenberg, or Copenhagen. The most powerful and the most gifted men of his generation were his correspondents, and he was indeed the oracle of Europe.

Since that time all the greater commonwealths have developed a national literature of their own, and when we return to Erasmus, we feel profoundly that such a life and such ideals have become simply impossible. I have seen at Basle the splendid portrait of Erasmus by Holbein. There is a countenance in which keen analytical power predominates. In this little paper I would present, partly as documents of the history of that time, specimens of his writings in which the satirist and moralist stands revealed. The artificiality of the classical allusions is too much for us, who groan under the micrology of ever-narrowing "research." But, inasmuch as my readers must be made to feel, in a concrete way, the dominant taste of that time, I begin my paper with some allusions culled from the greatest of his satires, *viz.*, the "Encomium Moriae," or Praise of Folly: Nectar, Nepenthe, the cave of Trophonius, the Favonius-wind, Midas, Pan, Hercules, Solon, Busiris, Phalaris, Thales, Mystae, Chaos, Orcus, Tapetos, Plutos, Hesiod, Homer, Pallas, the Plutus of Aristophanes, the floating isle of Delos, gardens of Adonis, with many a phrase, term, or sentence in Greek directly, the Stoics, the Square of Pythagoras, Sophocles, the Islands of the Blessed, a line from Apuleius, an allusion to Plautus, Nestor, Achilles, a phrase from Homer, Medea, Venus, Circe, Aurora, and Tithonus, an ephebus (of Athens), Sappho, a name of one who is a butt of Aristophanes' satire, Endymion, Momus, Priapus, Silenus, Polyphemus, the Atellanæ plays, Plato, the Seven Wise Men, etc., etc. All this from a few pages. We would not endure this "Humanism" any more. Excuse me. But let us see. Few of Erasmus's readers could promptly see every point, nor just how or why the allusion was apposite or per-

tinent; and still they looked up to him as a wonderful man. At bottom all this culture was artificial and the intellectual satisfaction therein revealed we may call naive. It is all like a meadow studded with—artificial flowers.

But in order to follow Erasmus at all, we must tolerate or ignore this classical investiture. I will now go forward to present some versions from his famous satire of his own times, choosing, as material of the history of the Church, and as presenting some perspective of the causes underlying the Reformation, certain portions of his famous diatribe, "The Praise of Folly":—

"But that class of men certainly belongs wholly to our own substance who rejoice in miracles and stupendous lies, either in listening to them or telling them, nor do they ever get their fill of such stories, when certain wonderful things are told, about ghosts, specters, spooks, the abode of the dead, and innumerable marvels of that kind. The further away these things are from the truth, the more largely are they believed, and with a more delightful sensation do they thrill the ears. And these indeed are not only wonderfully effective to beguile the time, but they are profitable also, especially to priests and preachers. Close to these again are those who have acquired a foolish, but pleasing conviction that, if they look on a certain wooden or painted giant Christophorus, they will not die on that day, or that he who greets a sculptured St. Barbara with a certain prescribed form of words will return unscathed from battle, or who calls on St. Erasmus on certain days, with certain candles and certain little prayers, will become rich in a short time. As for St. George, they have made of him a veritable Hercules or Hippolytus. His horse, adorned with trappings and medals in the most scrupulous fashion, they all but worship. . . . To swear by his brazen helmet is considered a downright royal achievement. What shall I say of those who flatter themselves with imaginary pardons for their crimes, and measure the spaces of purgatory as with clocks, centuries, years, months, days, hours, measuring

them out as though by a mathematical table, without any mistake? Or about those, who, relying on certain magic marks and prayers, which some pious impostor, either for fun or for gain, has devised, promise everything to themselves, wealth, honors, pleasures, a full belly, perfect health, long life, a green old age, finally a seat close to Christ in heaven, with whom, however, they do not want to have anything to do, unless very late, that is, when the pleasures of this life have deserted them, which they had been gripping, as it were, with their teeth; *then* those pleasures of the blessed in heaven should follow closely. Here, for instance, some merchant, soldier, or judge, casting away some single paltry coin out of so much loot, thinks the entire pool of his life is cleansed, so many false oaths, so many debaucheries, so many feuds, so much drunkenness, so many assassinations, so many swindling transactions, so many breaches of trust, so many acts of treason he thinks are canceled as by contract, and so canceled that he may now return, afresh, to a new cycle of crimes. . . . What now? Does it not amount pretty nearly to the same thing when particular regions claim their own particular saint, when they allot particular spheres to a particular saint, . . . that this one aids them in toothache, that one attends mothers in childbirth, another restores something stolen, this one is merciful in shipwreck, that one watches the flock? And so about the rest; for it would take too long to run through the entire list. There are those [saints] who, individually, are powerful in more than one sphere, especially the Virgin Mary, whom the average person credits with almost more than the Son. . . .

"Come, among so many consecrated gifts with which you behold all the walls of certain churches and the very ceiling to be filled, have you ever seen one person who escaped from folly? . . . One swam to land unharmed; another was pierced in battle and survived; another escaped from a battle (while the others were fighting), not less luckily than bravely; another, raised to the gallows, through the favor of some saint or other friendly to thieves, fell down, so that he continued to relieve

some men who were richer than they ought to be; another broke jail and escaped; another recovered from fever when the physician had lost his temper; another drank poison, his bowels were loosened, and it healed him instead of killing him, and this put out his wife, who had no reward for her pains; another had a runaway and brought the horses safely home. . . .

"So greatly is all the life of all Christians teeming with such hallucinations: the which the priests themselves not unwillingly both admit and foster, being well aware how much profit is wont to accrue to them from this source."

But let us go on to his description of the *monks*: "Next [to the theologians] come those persons who generally call themselves *religious persons* and monks, both being false terms, since both, a goodly part of them, are very far removed from religion, and none do you more come across everywhere [they do *not* live in solitude]. . . . Whereas the general public so abominate this class of men, that they consider even a chance meeting with them a bad omen, still they have a very high opinion of themselves. First they deem it the loftiest piety if they have so far shrunk from contact with letters that they cannot even read. Then, when they bray out (*derudunt*) their psalms, chanted rhythmically indeed, but not understood, then, indeed, they think they are soothing the ears of the saints with great pleasure. And there are some of these who sell their meanness and beggarliness for a great price, and before the doors, with loud bellowing, demand bread, nay, in all taverns, coaches, ships. Not only are they a nuisance with no slight loss to the other beggars. And to that extent these most detestable persons, in their mean exterior, their ignorance, boorishness, impudence, reproduce, as they claim, the apostles for us. And what is more delightful than that they do everything by regulation, as though by mathematical rules, which to transgress is a sin? How many knots their shoe must have, what color their belt, what shades their garments, what stuff, how broad their belt, what shape and how many peaks their

hood must hold, . . . how many hours they must sleep. And who does not perceive how unequal is this equality alongside of so great an inequality of bodies and minds? And still, with these futilities they not only despise others, but also they condemn one another, and men who profess apostolic charity, on account of a garment differently girdled, on account of a slightly darker shade, make a tremendous hullabaloo. . . . There are some who shrink from the touch of money as from a poison, but who meanwhile do not refrain from wine nor from women. . . . Their zeal is not to be like Christ, but to be unlike to one another. Further, a great deal of their felicity is in names; some are called Cordeliers (their zone a rope), and of these some are called *Fratres Minores*, others *Minimi*, others *Bullistae*. Again some are *Benedictines*, others *Bernardines*, others of *St. Bridget*, others *Augustinians*, others *Wilhelmites*, others *Jacobites*, as though it were too little to be called simply *Christians*. A great part of these rely so greatly on their own ceremonies and the little traditions of men as to think that a single heaven is not worthy enough as a reward for so great deserts; not thinking that Christ, despising all these things, will insist upon His own precept, *viz.*, that of charity. . . . One will point to a little basin stuffed with all kinds of fish. Another will recount an innumerable total of fasts, and charge his belly so many times almost splitting with a single repast. Another will bring forward such a heap of ceremonies as could hardly be conveyed by seven transports. Another will boast that in sixty years he never touched money unless his fingers were encased in double gloves. Another will show his hood: so dirty and coarse that no sailorman would consent to put it on. Another will tell that he spent a life of more than fifty-five years, always attached to the same spot. Another will produce his voice hoarse by incessant chanting; another, a numbness gathered in solitude; another, a tongue dulled by incessant silence. . . . When they shall hear this, and will see that sailors and drivers are preferred

to themselves, with what miens, think ye, will they gaze on one another? . . . And still these men, who are something apart from the commonwealth, no one dares to despise, especially the mendicant friars, because they possess all secrets of all men, from the so-called confessions, which, however, they deem it wrong to betray, unless sometimes, in their cups they wish to, but tell the matter vaguely, suppressing names. But if any one stir these hornets, then in their pulpit discourses they soundly revenge themselves, and brand their foe indirectly, so covertly that every one understands, unless one understands nothing; and they do not stop barking until you throw them a bone. Come now, what comedy-actor, what mountebank would you rather see than those men, rhetoricizing absurdly in their sermons, but still in the most charming manner imitating what the rhetoricians have taught about the theory of oratory? How do they gesticulate, how fitly do they change their pitch of voice, how they practise a singsong manner, how they vaunt themselves, how they keep changing their facial expression, how they fill everything with their shoutings! And this art of discourse, like an esoteric matter, one poor monk passes on to the other. Although it is not permissible to me to know it, still I shall follow it somehow by my conjectures. At the beginning they invoke what they have borrowed from the poets; then, being about to discourse on charity, they take their introduction from the river Nile; or when about to expound the mystery of the cross, they make a happy beginning with the Belus of Babylon; or when about to discourse on fasting, they begin with the twelve constellations of the zodiac; or when about to speak on *faith*, they speak in their introduction for a long time on the quadrature of the circle. I have myself heard a certain one particularly stupid,—I beg pardon, I wanted to say particularly erudite,—who, in a sermon before a very great audience, to show that his learning was not commonplace, and to satisfy theological ears, entered upon an absolutely novel path, that is, taking his cue from letters, syllables, and language, then, the agreement of noun and verb,

of adjective and substantive, while most of his hearers were sleeping, and some were quietly quoting the familiar line of Horace:

Quorsum haec tam putida tendunt?

Finally he brought his discourse to this point,—he showed that the image of the whole Trinity was so set forth in the elements of the teachers of language that no mathematician could more clearly draw it in the dust.”

But we must take another theme, *viz.*, “Erasmus on Cardinals and Popes,” keeping in mind that the famous satire was first published in 1509, in Paris:—

“As for the princes, their style of living is imitated by the popes, cardinals, and bishops from long ago, and with energy, and they almost outdo the princes. Further, if one were to reflect what the robe of linen suggests, with its snow-white color, namely, a conduct of life spotless at every point; what the two-pointed miter, the same knot holding both projections, means: a perfect knowledge of both the New and the Old Testament; what the gloved hands, *viz.*, the administration of the Sacraments free from all contact with worldly affairs; what the way they are shod, *viz.*, the most watchful care of the flock entrusted to them; what the cross borne before them, *viz.*, the conquest of all human passions. These things, I say, and many things of this kind, if one were to ponder on them, should he not lead a sad and anxious life? And now they have a good time in grazing themselves. As for the care of the sheep, they either entrust them to Christ Himself, or turn them over to brothers, so called, or to vicars. They do not remember their own title, what the term *episcopus* really means, *viz.*, toil, care, anxiety. But in netting money they quite fill the role of ἐπίσκοπος, οὐδ’ ἀλαοσκοπή (not a vain spying or seeing—a Homeric phrase).

“In the same way [*scil.*, as the bishops], if the *cardinals* were to think that they had succeeded to the place of the Apostles, that of them were demanded the same achievements as those of the Apostles; further, that they are not masters,

but stewards of spiritual gifts, for which in a short time they must give a most exact account; nay, if they were to reflect a little even on their garb and thus think: What means this whiteness of garb? Does it not mean an absolute and particular purity of life? What the inner crimson? Not the most burning love of God? What, again, the outward with its generous folds, and covering even the mule of his eminence, although one would be enough for covering a camel? Does it not mean a charity spreading itself very widely to aid all men, that is, to teach, exhort, console, rebuke, admonish, settle wars, resist wicked princes, and even willingly to shed their blood for the Christian flock, not only their means? And still, what for means, as they are the representatives of the poor apostles? If they were to ponder these things, I say, they would not strive hard for this place, and readily give it up, or at least spend a toilsome and anxious life, such as these apostles of old lived.

“Next the *popes*, who are the vicegerents of Christ; if they will attempt to imitate His life, *viz.*, poverty, toil, teaching, the cross, the contempt of life; if they were to reflect on the name *Papa*, that is, Father, even most sacred, what will there be in the world more troubled? Or who would buy that place with all his wealth, or, when bought, maintain it with the sword, with poison,<sup>1)</sup> and every form of force? How many advantages will he gain by these, if once wisdom has come along? Wisdom, did I say? Nay, even a grain of that salt which Christ mentioned. So much wealth, so many honors, so much sway, so many victories, so many offices, so many dispensations, so many revenues, so many indulgences, so many horses, mules, body-guards, so many pleasures! You see how great a mart, how great a harvest, how great an ocean of good things I have embraced in a few words. In place of these he will assume vigils, fasting, tears, prayers, sermons, studies, sighs, and a thousand wretched labors of this

---

1) The allusion to Alexander VI seems to be unmistakable.

kind. And that also must not be neglected, that so many clerks, so many copyists, so many notaries, so many advocates, . . . so many secretaries, so many grooms of mules, so many stable-masters, so many attendants at table, so many procurers (almost I added something still more effeminate, but I fear it may be too harsh to hear); in a word, so vast an aggregation of men which burdens—I blundered, I should say honors—the see of Rome, may be driven to starvation. It would be inhuman and an atrocious deed, and much more to be execrated, to have even the highest princes of the Church reduced to bag and staff. But nowadays, as a rule, if there is work, they leave it to Peter and Paul, who have leisure enough; but if there is any splendor or pleasure, they take it for themselves. And so it comes about . . . that almost no class of men lives more softly and with less anxiety, inasmuch as they think Christ is abundantly satisfied, if they act the role of bishops with a mystic and almost theatrical staging, with ceremonies, with titles of reverences, sanctities, with benedictions and maledictions. It is an ancient and obsolete thing, and not befitting the present time, to perform miracles. To teach the people is troublesome; to interpret the sacred Scriptures smacks of the schoolmaster; to pray is a waste of time; to shed tears is wretched and womanish; to be poor is mean; to be defeated is base, and not sufficiently worthy of him who barely admits even the greatest kings to kiss his saintly feet; finally, to die is unlovely, and to be raised to the cross is infamous. There remain only these, arms and sweet benedictions which St. Paul mentions and with these some [*scil.*, popes] are indeed lavish, to wit, interdicts, suspensions, aggravations, redaggravations, anathematizations, penal pictures, and that awful thunderbolt, by which, by the mere nod, they send the souls of men to the deepest hell. This the most saintly fathers in Christ and vicars of Christ hurl against none the more keenly than against those who at the devil's instigation attempt to lessen, or gnaw at, the patrimony of St. Peter. When his utterance is recorded in the Gospel:

'We have forsaken everything and followed Thee,' still they call *his patrimony* lands, towns, revenues, harbor-dues, sway. While they, inflamed by their zeal for Christ, fight for these<sup>2)</sup> with fire and sword, not without the shedding of a great deal of Christian blood, then only they believe they are defending the Church, the Bride of Christ, in an apostolic manner, having bravely routed the foe, as they call it; as though there were any foes of the Church more pernicious than wicked popes, who allow Christ to pass out in silence, and bind Him with statutes concerned with material profit, and adulterate [the sense of His words. E. G. S.] with forced interpretations and slay Him with a corrupt life."

University Heights, N. Y.

E. G. SIHLER.

## LUTHER'S CONDUCT TOWARD THE ROMAN CATHOLICS.

It was the 10th of December in the year of our Lord 1520. On the morning of that memorable day a large and curious crowd of people had gathered before the Elster-gate of the German university town of Wittenberg. The people had come to witness a most strange and startling spectacle. For the renowned Augustinian friar and professor of the town, Dr. Martin Luther, had boldly given out the news that at the time and place aforesaid he would publicly burn the bull of excommunication which the Pope of Rome had recently published against him. Promptly at nine o'clock, and surrounded by an enthusiastic following of students and fellow-professors, the intrepid monk appears. He is a man still in the prime of life, about thirty-seven years of age, but there is nothing heroic or impressive about his bodily appearance. He is below medium size, and his lean body still shows the severe effects of his former monastic life, where he nearly fasted and studied him-

2) Erasmus seems to allude to Julius II, then reigning, the military pope.

self to death. However, the bold cast of his rugged countenance, the ringing tones of his high-pitched voice, and the compelling look of his falcon-like eyes, all portray the heroic soul burning in this determined and courageous man.

Approaching the fagots already heaped and ignited by willing hands, Luther casts into them the papal bull and the canonical laws, exclaiming with flashing eyes: "Because thou hast offended the Holy One of the Lord" (namely, Christ, whose doctrine Luther had proclaimed, and which the Pope had condemned), "be thou consumed by everlasting fire!" It was a bold thing for Luther to do. By that act he publicly and forever withdrew from the Church of Rome—the Church of his fathers, the Church in which he had been born and raised. Since that eventful day the visible Church of Christ is torn into the great warring camps of Protestantism and Romanism. What shall we say to this act of Luther?

What Roman Catholic authorities think and say of Luther's conduct is known only too well. Owing to their persistent and malicious misrepresentations of his life and work, Luther has become the worst slandered man in history. In this year of jubilee Rome has flooded the market with cheap publications that revamp its old, time-worn charges against the great Reformer.

But how about Luther? Can he ever answer to God for his treatment of the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church? The answer concerns us very intimately, for we bear Luther's name and share his Gospel-doctrine. If Luther was wrong, then we are wrong and need to repent in sackcloth and ashes instead of arranging joyous commemorative festivities in this year of jubilee. If Luther was right, then we are right, provided we follow the example he left us in this matter.

Well, what are the facts, the true facts, that caused Luther to withdraw from the Church of Rome? We know facts are stubborn things, and the facts in Luther's case are so stubborn that even four hundred years of Roman falsification, vituperation, and bloody persecution have not been able to change

them, or wipe them from the annals of history. The facts, briefly, are these: Driven by his conscience, Luther had protested against certain glaring abuses practised by the indulgence-mongers of his day. But the Ninety-five Theses he published against these abuses still prove him to be an obedient and loyal son of Rome. There is not one hint of reform in them, nor one word on justification by faith, which afterwards became the watchword of the Reformation. No base, carnal motives prompt him, but as he declares: "Out of love for the truth, and the desire to bring it to light," he publishes his propositions on indulgences. Love and zeal for the truth characterize all his future conduct in the controversy. He is vilified and slandered by the indulgence-mongers, and appeals to the Pope, "I have heard evil reports about myself, most blessed Father, by which I know that certain friends have put my name in very bad odor with you and yours, saying that I have attempted to belittle the power of the keys and of the Supreme Pontiff. Therefore, I am accused of heresy, apostasy, and perfidy, and am called by six hundred names of ignominy." Then he tells the Pope how he had tried in vain to persuade some of the prelates of the Church to abolish these abuses by which the fair name of the Church and the power and honor of the Pope were defamed and sullied. But his appeal is in vain. Twice more does Luther in all humility and sincerity carry his case to the Pope: he even dedicates to him his immortal treatise "On Christian Liberty," and we challenge any Roman Catholic authority to find an unchristian word or thought in these three letters of Luther and his treatise. But the Pope has only one answer to his supplicant son, "*Recant,*" *i. e.*, deny the truth, "or be excommunicated and damned as a heretic!" Verily, the guilt for the present sad division in the Christian Church between Protestants and Catholics lies not at the door of Luther, but at the door of his Roman Catholic enemies, at the door of the Pope. That is the verdict of history.

But the question is not merely a question of history. It is more serious—it is a question of conscience with us. Hence

we ask: Can Luther claim God's sanction for his momentous step?

Let us ask what kind of Church was and is the Roman Catholic from which Luther withdrew, and millions of Christians with him since Reformation times? This Church claims to be the one true catholic Church, without whose pale there is no salvation. Is her claim founded on fact, incontrovertible Scriptural fact? Does this Church teach, believe, and confess all things which the ascending Savior commands His disciples faithfully to observe and teach to the world (Matt. 28, 20)? She does not. It is a fact, for instance, that the Roman Catholic Church openly practises the grossest kind of idolatry in her worship of Mary and the dead saints, whereas Christ commands: "Thou shalt worship the Lord, thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. 4). Again: "No one cometh unto the Father but by Me" (John 14, 6). It is a fact that the Roman Catholic Church corrupts and mutilates the blessed Sacrament of our Lord by robbing the laity of the cup, whereas Christ says: "Drink ye all of it." It is a fact that the Roman Catholic priest in his Mass daily offers up Christ anew for the sins of the living and the dead, whereas it is clearly written Heb. 9, 12: "Christ by His own blood entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." And Heb. 10, 14: "For by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." It is a fact that the Roman Catholic Church forbids its priests, monks, and nuns to marry, whereas the Word of God declares such a prohibition of marriage to be a doctrine of the devil (1 Tim. 4, 3). It is a fact that the Roman Catholic Church teaches that man must obtain forgiveness for his sins and eternal salvation by his own works, penances, confessions, and atonements, whereas the Word of God says: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. 4, 5).

Lo, that was and is the character of the Church from which Luther seceded on that historic 10th of December, 1520,

when he publicly burned the papal bull. Did he have the right to do so? Not only the right, but it was his sacred, yea, an imperative duty; for here is the clear command of Christ Himself: "Beware of false prophets" (Matt. 7, 15), and of Christ's inspired Apostle: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses *contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them*" (Rom. 16, 17); "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted and sinneth, being condemned of himself" (Titus 3, 10). No matter how much the Romanists revile Luther for leaving their Church, he treated them as God wants us to treat all obdurate false teachers and churches: "Come out from among them and be ye separate" (2 Cor. 6, 14—18). Even though that cause strife, we must obey God more than man.

But how? did not Luther go too far in his antagonism against the Pope? Is it not preposterous in him to inveigh against the Pope of Rome as the Antichrist in his writings? Was it not sheer fanaticism, unholy hatred in him to write such a book as his "The Papacy at Rome Founded by the Devil"? So many take offense at this "blind hatred," as they call it, in Luther against the Roman See. But what are the facts? Luther, before his conversion, was a zealous advocate of popery. He writes in his preface to his complete works, 1545: "Above all things I beseech the Christian reader and beg him for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ to read my earliest books very circumspectly and with much pity, knowing that formerly I, too, was a monk, and one of the right frantic and raving papists. When I took up this matter against indulgences, I was so full and drunken, yea, so besotted in papal doctrine that, out of my great zeal, I would have been ready to do murder—at least, I would have been glad to see and help that murder should be done—on all who would not be obedient and subject to the Pope, even to his smallest word." But what happened? God, in His saving mercy, opened Luther's eyes, and he found Christ as his only Savior

in the blessed Gospel. From that day Luther ceased to be an abject slave of the Pope, and became a faithful servant and confessor of Christ. He now declared with David: "I believed, therefore have I spoken," and with the apostles Peter and John, when the high priests and elders at Jerusalem forbade them to witness of the crucified and risen Savior: "We cannot but speak the things we have seen and heard." Luther could not remain silent when members of his own flock were led astray by the shameful traffic in indulgences. He testified against it in his Ninety-five Theses, and with what result you know. He was attacked and defamed by Roman theologians, among them a certain Dr. Eck, with whom he held a public debate at Leipzig in July, 1519. In preparing for this debate, Luther was compelled to study the canon laws and decretals of the Popes, and among them found such laws and decisions as these: "The oath given by subjects to heretical [non-Catholic] princes is no oath, but perjury." (Gregory XIII.) "They are not to be adjudged murderers who, inflamed by love for our Mother-Church, kill the excommunicated." (Gregory XIII.) And among the canon laws stood and stands to this day the following: "When the Pope, unmindful of his and his brethren's eternal welfare, is found negligent, unprofitable, and slothful, and, moreover, secretly drags with him, as the first-born child of hell, countless numbers of souls away from what is good, which, indeed, will harm him most, but, nevertheless, also all the others, who will suffer great agony with him through all eternity,—yet in such an event no mortal may venture to reprove him for his sins, because he who is to judge all dare not be judged by any one else." (*Corpus Jur. Can. Rom.*, Part XI, dist. 1, chap. 6.) Studying these and similar blasphemous laws of the Popes in the light of the divine prophecies concerning Antichrist, especially the classical proof-passage of Paul in 2 Thess. 2, 3—12, where the characteristic mark of Antichrist is declared to be that he sits in the temple, *i. e.*, in the Church of God, and exalts himself above God, as the Pope evidently does in his laws and ordi-

nances,—I say it was then that Luther's eyes were opened to the mystery of iniquity, to antichristian popery. Hence, when Pope Leo X issued his bull of excommunication against him and the Gospel of Christ he was preaching, Luther in holy wrath burned the infamous bull, and on the following day, in his lectures, warned his hearers to beware of papal laws and statutes.

But right here, friends, let us learn the important fact that a fundamental difference exists between popery and the Roman Church as such. Popery in itself is not the Roman Church, but a foreign body, a deadly fungus growing on the Roman branch of the Church catholic, or universal. Long before popery arose, which was in the seventh century, there existed a Christian Church at Rome, to which Paul addressed the glorious epistle we still possess in our New Testament. Though in Luther's time the church at Rome and all other churches in Christianity had come under the baneful power and influence of antichristian popery, Luther had no quarrel with the honest Christian still to be found in these churches. When he withdrew from the pope-ridden Catholic Church on that eventful day in 1520, he did not withdraw from the Catholic or Christian Church as such. It is a baseless charge Roman Catholic writers, for instance, Cardinal Gibbons in his book *The Faith of Our Fathers*, make against Luther in declaring that he set up and founded a new church, which he calls the Lutheran sect. Luther victoriously answered this old, time-worn charge in his polemical treatise (1541) against Duke Henry of Brunswick, whom he calls the Buffoon (Hans Wurst), in which he clearly proves that the Church of the Pope has fallen away from the true Christian Church, whereas the Church of the Reformation is the old Catholic Church, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner-stone (Eph. 2). You know how vehemently Luther protested against calling the restored Gospel Church after his name. (Dau, *Four Hundred Years*, 304 ff.)

Supercilious critics take offense, when reading Luther's works, at the harsh and violent language he often uses against his papistical opponents. But what would these people have? The manners and the language of the sixteenth century were not as refined and polished as they are in this twentieth century. Shakespeare, who died on the first centenary of the Reformation (1616), uses language in his dramas you would not dare to use in the classroom or in polite society. Moreover, we must not forget Luther's peculiar mission, which was, as rightly declared by Elector John Frederick, the Mag-nanimous, the overthrow of popery. "Hence," says the Elector, "Luther uses such violent words not without good reason. His intention is not to convert popery, which is not possible, and therefore popery needs no fair words. Luther's avowed purpose is to show up popery so plainly that everybody may clearly recognize its abomination, and learn to beware of it." (Luther, *Volksbibliothek*, Band 25, Vorrede.) We may also add that for many of the harsh expressions Luther uses he is in good company, in the company of a Paul, who declares Gal. 1, 9: "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed"; and who speaks of the enemies of the Cross as people whose "god is their belly" (Phil. 3, 19). Aye, Luther is in the company of our dear Lord and Savior Himself, who denounces the self-righteous, avaricious, and hypocritical Pharisees of His time in the most scathing terms (Matt. 23).

Luther never engaged in secret and underhand warfare against his opponents, as many of them did and do to this day by publishing anonymous and scurrilous attacks against him. He can declare boldly and truthfully: "Now I have openly published my name in all my books and acted in broad daylight, offered to stand trial, and still make that offer; and although I have attacked the government of the Pope, yet I have never assailed his person or that of any of his prelates or his subordinates, neither anybody's secret vices, but denounced the public, common vices, as a pastor must do and all the

prophets have done. If such books are slanderous libels, then no public vice dare any longer be rebuked, and the Gospel and entire Bible must be called a slanderous book; for in it are written so many and such harsh penalties against wickedness."

However, it must be said to Luther's lasting credit that he was not too proud humbly to admit that occasionally he had used intemperate language against his adversaries. In his defense before the Diet at Worms he confessed concerning the third class of his books, his polemical writings against individual enemies and private persons, that he had been more violent than good custom permitted, and at other occasions he declared that his old Adam put many a word on his tongue that his Lord Christ had to suppress.

In accordance with the clearly revealed doctrine of Holy Scripture, Luther believed and taught that the true Catholic Church is not the church of the Pope, but the invisible Church of Christ, which exists wherever true believing Christians are to be found; for it is faith in Christ, and this faith alone, that makes you a member of the one, true Christian Church, which alone is the communion of saints. And such true Christians are to be found even under Antichrist, in the Church of Rome. In his explanation of the 45th Psalm Luther writes: "Thus there have at all times been a few in popery who believed, and there are many such even to this day, whom we do not know, whom God preserves through the Word and Sacraments, in spite of the devil and the pope." And again, in his exposition of Galatians: "Wherever Word and Sacrament essentially remain, there also remains a holy Church, and it matters not if Antichrist also reigns there, who does not reside in a devil's stable, nor in a pig-sty, nor in the company of unbelievers, but in the noblest and holiest place, namely, in the temple of God (2 Thess. 2, 4). From which it is certain and clear that God's temple must be and remain also under the spiritual tyrants that rule and rage therein." From 1 Kings 19 we see how God had preserved a remnant of seven thousand elect among idolatrous Israel of whom even His prophet Elijah knew nothing.

And 2 Sam. 15, 11, we read of two hundred men who joined the rebellion of Absalom, but went in their simplicity and knew not anything. So there are untold numbers in the Church of Rome who sincerely believe in Christ, yet outwardly cling to their false teachers, because they have not discerned the depths of Satan (Rev. 2). There were many such in Reformation times; and how did Luther treat them? As Scriptures command, Rom. 15, 1: "We, then, that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." And 1 Thess. 5, 15: "Support the weak; be patient with all men." Luther writes in his "Admonition":

"In the second place: If you would contend for the Gospel in a Christian manner, you must pay due regard to the persons with whom you are speaking. These are of two kind. First: Some of them are hardened reprobates, who do not want to hear, and in addition seduce and poison others with their lying lips, like the Pope does and Eck, Emser, some of our bishops, priests, and monks. With these you are not to dispute, but act according to Christ's command, Matt. 7, 6: 'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet and turn again and rend you.' . . . But if you see that these liars instil their lies and poison into other people, then you are to valiantly oppose and do battle against them, just as Paul opposed Elymas, Acts 13, 10, with harsh and sharp words, and Christ denounced the Pharisees as a generation of vipers. That you are to do not on their account, for they will not hear, but for the sake of those whom they seek to poison. Likewise Paul commands Titus, chap. 1, 10, to sharply rebuke the vain talkers and deceivers.

"On the other hand, there are some who have not heard these things before, and would gladly learn them if instructed, or who are so weak that they cannot easily comprehend them. These are not to be browbeaten and stormed at, but instructed in a friendly and gentle manner, and shown the cause and reason, and borne in patience meanwhile if they cannot im-

mediately grasp it. Wherefore Paul says, Rom. 14, 1: 'The weak in faith receive.' Also St. Peter, 1 Ep. 3, 16: 'Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear.' Here you see that in meekness and fear of God we are to give an account of our faith to every one who desires or needs it."

Though assailed and vilified on all sides by the papists, Luther would not repay them in kind, but, foregoing all thoughts of revenge, he wrote in his answer to the celebrated Romanist at Leipzig (Holman, 1, 393): "As for the slanders and evil names with which my person is assailed, although numerous enough, I will let my dear Romanists off without reply. They do not trouble me. It has never been my intention to avenge myself on those who rail at my person, my life, my works, my doings. That I am not worthy of praise, I myself know full well. But I will let no man reproach me that in defending the Scriptures I am more pointed and impetuous than some seem to like; neither will I be silenced. Whoever will, let him freely scold, slander, condemn my person and my life; it is already forgiven him. But let no one expect from me either grace or patience who would make my Lord Christ, whom I preach, and the Holy Ghost, to be liars. I am nothing at all. But for the Word of Christ I give answer with joyful heart and vigorous courage, and without respect of persons. To this end God has given me a glad and fearless spirit, which they shall not embitter, I trust, in all eternity."

So Luther returned not evil for evil, but did good to them that hated him, and prayed for them that spitefully used him and persecuted him. When Tetzl lay mortally ill at Leipzig in 1519, Luther wrote him, comforting him and bidding him "not to be troubled, for the matter did not begin on his account, but the child had a different father." He writes his earnest "Admonition" to his followers at Wittenberg "to beware of tumult and rebellion" (January, 1522); and when Carlstadt with his fanatical spirits started disorder, demolishing images, abolishing the mass, etc., Luther, at the risk of his

life, left his safe retreat at the Wartburg and hurried to Wittenberg to quell the disorder. He refused the armed protection of the German knight Ulrich von Hutten and wrote to Spalatin: "I would not like to see men fight for the Gospel with force and bloodshed. I have answered the man accordingly. By the Word the world has been overcome, the Church has been preserved; by the Word it will also be restored." He inveighs against the murderous and thieving peasants, and writes emphatically that sedition is a deluge of all kinds of vice. In his defense over against his implacable foe Duke George of Saxony he declares: "Now a child of seven years knows and understands it to be true Christian doctrine when you teach the people to suffer, give way, risk life and goods, forsake them, and not rebel against their government and tyrants, for the sake of God, as my letter shows; in behalf of which I appeal to all Christians, yea, to all common sense in all the world. Verily, I would appeal to Bileam's ass and all asses and cows, if they could talk." Most urgently he advises his Elector John not to engage in war against the emperor, saying: "We would rather suffer a tenfold death than have that guilt burden our conscience that our Gospel was the cause of any bloodshed or injury whatever that arose for our sake; for we are to be those who suffer, as the prophet writes, and accounted as sheep led forth to slaughter, and not avenge or defend ourselves."

No, Luther was not the instigator of rebellion and sedition, as his Roman enemies like to paint him. Though the Pope and his henchmen persecuted the Evangelical Christians with fire and sword, Luther enumerates it as one of the proofs that the old Christian Church and truth is on his side when he writes in his polemic against "Hans Wurst": "In the tenth place, no one can deny that we do not in return likewise shed blood, kill, or hang [our enemies], as we often might have done or still could do, but as Christ, the apostles, and the ancient Church did, so do we—we suffer, admonish, and intercede for them, even publicly in the church, in the litanies and sermons, in every way as Christ, our Lord, has done and taught,

the ancient Church likewise, so that also in this matter we faithfully observe all the old ways of the ancient Church." (*Volksbibl.*, Vol. 30, p. 231.)

True, in his epoch-making "Letter to the Christian Nobility of Germany" (1520), Luther, as a patriotic German, inveighs against the fearful encroachments of the Pope on the political rights and liberties of Germany, advising reasonable and practical remedies; but the whole gist of the letter is an appeal to the God-ordained civil powers to so change political conditions that the souls who were going to destruction through the wicked rule of Rome might be saved. At all times and on all occasions the dear man of God has only the welfare of souls in mind; these he would save, save alone by means of the Gospel. The weapons of his warfare were not carnal, as with his Roman opponents, but only spiritual, the Gospel of Christ, and hence they proved so mighty to the pulling down of the papal strongholds.

To the question, then, How did Luther treat the Roman Catholics? we must answer: According to the clear and saving rule of God's holy Word. Against the heresies and false doctrines of the Roman Catholics, especially their Popes, he testified in holy fervor with the truth of Holy Scriptures. But as regards the persons of his enemies, he did not revenge himself on them, but prayed for them, did good unto them, and showed to the weak and erring among them Christian forbearance and sympathy.

Though popery received its death-wound in the Reformation at the hands of Luther, it will not be destroyed until, as Paul says (2 Thess. 2), the Lord Himself will do so with the brightness of His coming. Till then the Great Mystery of Wickedness will remain, and it is the sacred duty of all Christians at all times to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints also over against Rome. But how? Let us learn it from Luther. All secret organizations, all sensational and unfounded attacks on Rome in the A. P. A. press avail nothing. Such tactics only serve to pour oil on the smoldering flames of re-

ligious prejudice and hatred obtaining in wide circles between Catholics and Protestants in this country. All other countries have had their religious wars. God, in His mercy, has so far spared our country from such a fearful calamity; yet if unmistakable signs portend anything, it is this, that our country is drifting slowly, yet inevitably, to the awful brink of religious war. Doubly great, then, is our duty as loyal citizens of our country and as faithful subjects of Christ's saving kingdom to step into the breach, and to do all in our power to prevent so terrible a disaster as a religious war would be both for Church and State. On the one hand, it will be our sacred duty to oppose all Protestant fanatics of our days, who, like Carlstadt and his followers of old, would prevent our Catholic fellow-citizens from worshiping God after their own manner. That is their constitutional right, and we would be poor Americans and worse Lutherans indeed if we in any way would help to deprive them of that right. Let no Lutheran therefore join any political secret organization against the Catholic Church. There is no need of such organizations; they can only do harm. Whenever and wherever it becomes apparent that certain forces of Rome seek to encroach on the liberties of our Republic, and, for instance, demand a division of public money for the support of their church-schools, then we as citizens have the ballot to successfully oppose any and all such machinations. But our chief duty is, and will remain, to spread diligently and systematically the saving Gospel-truth as we possess it in our Lutheran Church, so that he who runs may read, be he Catholic, Jew, or Calvinist, what is the faith we hold. It was Luther's pious boast that through the Gospel-doctrine he succeeded where all church-councils, kings, and other great men before him had failed. Let us follow the example he left us. Let us spread God's pure Word in season and out of season among our countrymen. Much has been done here of late; much still remains to be done. Our National Lutheran Publicity Bureau is at present waging a very successful warfare against the prevailing ignorance in this country

on things Lutheran. Whoever loves his country, whoever loves his Church, let him support these brethren in their noble work, and join their ranks. Zealously spreading the Word, adorning our faith with a Christian life, loving our fellow-men, praying God to mercifully open the eyes of the enemies of His Gospel and bring them out of their darkness into the marvelous light of His saving grace, we shall be true followers of Luther, and may confidently sing with him:

The Word they still shall let remain,  
And not a thank have for it.  
He's by our side upon the plain  
With His good gifts and Spirit.  
And take they our life,  
Goods, fame, child, and wife,  
Let all these be gone,  
They yet have nothing won;  
The kingdom ours remaineth.

St. Louis, Mo.

F. W. HERZBERGER.

---

## BOOK REVIEW.

---

*Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:—*

1. *DER REFORMATOR*. Ein Lebensbild Dr. Martin Luthers. Unserer lutherischen Jugend als Jubiläumsgabe dargeboten von W. Wegener. 112 pages; 33 cts.

In twenty chapters the story of the Reformation, including a description of pre-Reformation times, is comprehensively, entertainingly, and instructively told for young people. Twenty illustrations representing scenes from the life of Luther help to fix the reader's mind on prominent events in the Reformer's activity.

2. *SYNODICAL REPORT OF THE ATLANTIC DISTRICT*, containing a doctrinal paper (German) by Prof. R. W. Heintze on "The Beneficent Influence of the Reformation on Schools." 84 pages; 18 cts.
3. *SYNODICAL REPORT OF THE SOUTHERN ILLINOIS DISTRICT*, containing a doctrinal paper (German) by Dr. F. Pieper on "The Reconciliation of Man with God." 68 pages; 11 cts.
4. *SYNODICAL REPORT OF THE WESTERN DISTRICT*, containing a doctrinal paper (German) by Dr. E. A. W. Krauss on "Luther and Carlstadt." 64 pages; 13 cts.

5. *THE CASE AGAINST THE LODGE*, with special reference to the *Woodmen of the World*. By *Benjamin M. Holt*. 72 pages; 22 cts.

In 6 chapters the author shows the antichristian character of the religion of the lodges. Special value attaches to this pamphlet, written in animated style, because of the account of actual experiences of the author and others being interwoven with his argument.

6. *KING OTTO'S CROWN*. Translated from the German of *Richard Roth*. By *Mary E. Ireland*. 139 pages; 44 cts.

The story is not only healthy reading-matter for the leisure-hour, but also instructive because of its historical background and historical references to an important epoch in the history of Germany.

7. *KINDERGOTTESDIENST AM REFORMATIONSJUBILAEUM*, 31. Oktober 1917. Von *Wilh. Simon*. 11 pages; 5 cts.

8. *BADGES, BUTTONS, AND BOW-PINS*. — a) A *Jubilee Badge* of silk ribbon in three colors, red, white and blue (10 cts.) with b) a *Celluloid Button* (also to be had singly), bearing the legend 1517—1917 (12 cts. per dozen); c) a small-size *United States Flag Button* (7 cts. each); d) a silk *United States Flag Bow-pin* (5 cts.).

*Wartburg Publishing House, Chicago:—*

*QUELLEN UND DOKUMENTE ZUR GESCHICHTE UND LEHRDARSTELLUNG DER EV.-LUTH SYNODE VON IOWA U. A. ST.* Gesammelt von *G. J. Fritschel, D.D.* 1.—3. Lieferung, pp. 49—144; 45 cts.

The idea underlying this publication is excellent, and we venture to say that a similar publication is needed for the Missouri Synod. The idea is to publish available documents relating to the origin of the Iowa Synod. In the three numbers so far published there is much contained that is of deep interest to Missourians. In fact, all the contents relate as much, if not more, to the history of the Missouri Synod as to that of Iowa. We have not the means to compare the citations which the author offers with his original. What he has offered in these three issues of his serial publication is very helpful to historians of the American Lutheran Church.

*Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee:—*

*LUTHER AND JUSTIFICATION*. By *William Dallmann*. 20 pages; 5 cts.

This publication is a reprint of the author's contribution to *Four Hundred Years*, twice reviewed in the *THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY*.

*The F. J. Heer Printing Co., Columbus, O.:—*

**INTRODUCTION TO LUTHERAN SYMBOLICS.** A Historical Survey of the Oecumenical and Particular Creeds of the Lutheran Church, an Outline of Their Contents, and an Interpretation of Their Theology on the Basis of the Doctrinal Articles of the Augsburg Confession. By *J. L. Neve, D. D.* With contributions by *Geo. J. Fritschel, D. D.* VII and 439 pages; \$1.75.

The "justification for publishing this work lies in the fact that it has been given the form of a text-book for use in the theological seminaries of the Lutheran Church of our country." After an Introduction, in which the import of the term "symbol" and the relative authority of the particular symbols of the Lutheran Church is discussed and historical data relating to the formal acceptance of the Lutheran Confessions are given (p. 14—31), the authors discuss the history and contents of the Apostles' (pp. 31—51), the Nicene (pp. 52 to 62), the Athanasian Creed (pp. 62—73), the Augsburg Confession (pp. 74—292), the Apology (pp. 292—339), the Smalcald Articles (pp. 339—354), the Catechisms of Luther (pp. 355—384), and the Formula of Concord (pp. 384—428). This enumeration of the contents of the book shows that the author really does not treat "Symbolics," — the brief introduction is no justification of his too pretentious title! — but the Lutheran symbols. — The controversy between Kaftan and Stier on the binding force of the Lutheran Symbols is left undecided (p. 29). Zwingli has been rightly included in the antithesis of Art. II of the A. C. (p. 125). The criticism on Augustine's view of the justifying act of God is deserved (p. 143). "Middle-cause" (p. 148) is a term which we would not like to see take the place of "instrumental cause"; in fact, the term "cause" should be dropped altogether in explaining the part which the means of grace and man's faith have in justification. Since the old Protestant dogmaticians, whose *forte* was analysis and keen distinction, are paralleled with the better view of Frank on the mutual inclusion of the active and passive obedience of Christ (p. 150), attention may be called to the fact that Quenstedt says what Dr. Neve says, *viz.*, that the active obedience embraces the passive, and *vice versa* (*Loc. de Justif.*, § 55); and Mentzer has a still profounder remark on the admissibility of the term "obedience" in the phrase "passive obedience" (*Disputatt. theol.* III, 441). — It is correctly held (p. 158) that the real object of Art. V of the A. C. is not to explain the functions of the ministry so much as to state the origin of justifying faith, in connection with the preceding article. — The two methods for "rectification of doctrinally detrimental influences" in a Lutheran Synod, *viz.*, "immediate discipline or educational method" (p. 177), should not be disjoined, but conjoined, and the effort mentioned last should be placed first. No synod discharges its full duty towards errorists by either of the two processes named. — We must forbear, for lack of space, noting assent to, or dissent from, the authors' positions at greater length. Of the book viewed as a whole we would like to say that we consider it a useful book and a helpful guide to the study of the confessional writings of our Church. Not only does it offer the beginner in this

branch of theological study a wealth of pertinent information and copious references to special literature, but it is, moreover, written in a plain and easy style. The authors' diction, however, leaves room for improvement. Cross-references should refer the reader to the exact page, not to the topical arrangement which the author has adopted.

*Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill.:—*

1. *APOLOGETICS, OR A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE.* By C. E. Lindberg, D. D., LL. D. 216 pages; \$1.50.

It is reassuring to read in the Preface to this book: "The best apology of the Bible is the Bible, and the best apologist of Christ is He Himself. If the New Testament would be constantly and prayerfully read by inquirers, there would be no need of Christian apologies." It is not only the endearing modesty of an author that attracts in this statement, but its truth. Apologetics has certainly been grievously overestimated by some, much to the detriment of this useful science. As Christian truth has been self-authenticating long before there was a science of apologetics, it will always be so. On the other hand, any effort to meet the unbeliever on his own ground and show him the inconclusiveness of his own arguments, any effort to remove difficulties in the Bible without destroying the meaning of Bible-statements, must be welcomed. There are many secondary proofs for the divine origin and the truth of the Christian religion, and to have this brought together in a book and classified for ready reference is a useful undertaking.—After an introductory chapter, in which the author discusses the Definition and the History of Apologetics and the Causes of Unbelief, he presents the apologetic material in five chapters, agreeably to the conventional divisions of dogmatics: Theological, Anthropological, Soteriological, Pneumatological, and Eschatological Apologetics. In reference to the inspiration of the Scriptures the author says: "It would be psychologically impossible that the ideas could be inspired without words or form. There is no idea without form. We must, therefore, explain the process as a concurrence of the divine and human spirit in the very act of creating the thoughts. There was no dictation in the inspiration, but the revealed facts would imply a direct intuition. But even in a case when there would be a mode analogous to dictation, the production of the revelation in the writing would require the concurrence of inspiration. The Bible contains revealed facts and inspired matter, but both were produced in the written form by the act of inspiration. And we should always keep in mind the bearing of the human factor which explains the individuality and style of writing." (p. 62 f.) This statement is much better than the claim that the Bible is theanthropic, partly of God, partly of man. When the human element is restricted to the style and individuality of the various writers, nothing can be said against it. Verbal inspirationists since Quenstedt and Calov have always acknowledged it. The offense, however, at the dictation theory has always struck us as a piece of prudery. If the suggestion of an idea for its completeness requires expression in words, what is the difference between "direct intuition" and dictation? The days of

creation the author regards as periods. (p. 43.) On the astronomical data of Scripture the author is halting: "The Biblical writers would have been fallible and uninspired if they had held or represented the physics of the day as absolute, as they stated that the Gospel was absolutely correct for all time. The authors employed the geocentric physics in the same way as Kepler and Newton, or any one who speaks of sunrise and sunset. But we cannot deny that the Bible is in some instances committed to a certain view. The instances are very plain when God reveals facts in creation that would otherwise never have been known. We find several such disclosures in Genesis. The Biblical statements can stand the test of science, and, therefore, no one should be disturbed by scientific claims." (p. 44.) The last statement is correct and sufficient. In speaking of the beginning and development of Christian experience, the author holds that the call of grace produces in the favorable event a state of passiveness, which state man realizes through illumination. "It [illumination] is a test which is necessary, whether man will conclude to become passive and thus allow the spirit to work." While seemingly advocating the monergism of grace, the author is swayed by a fear of teaching a compulsory conversion, and destroying man's responsibility as regards resistance or non-resistance to grace. (p. 146 f.) The difference he has noted between Philippi and Frank (p. 141 f.) has not been removed. It cannot be.

## 2.-ALMANAC FOR THE YEAR 1917.

Contains almanac, clerical register, and statistics of the Swedish Augustana Synod.

## 3. REPORT OF THE NINTH ANNUAL CONVENTION of the Association of the English Churches of the Augustana Synod.

*Cooperative Literature Committee Woman's Missionary Societies Lutheran Church, Columbia, S. C.:—*

*THE STORY OF LUTHERAN MISSIONS.* By Mrs. Elsie Singmaster. 221 pages; 40 cts., paper; 60 cts., cloth. 34 illustrations.

Lutheran missionary efforts in India, Africa, China, Japan, and on the Western Continent are told in pleasing style and with a wealth of information by the author, to whom her task has plainly been a very congenial one. The book is devoted chiefly to recounting the fortunes of Foreign Missions of the General Synod and General Council. Those of other American Lutheran bodies receive only a passing notice.

*General Council Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa.:—*

*THE WAY OF SALVATION IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.* By G. H. Gerberding, D. D., LL. D. 32d thousand. Revised, improved, and enlarged. Reformation Jubilee Edition. 280 pages; \$1.00.

A vademecum along the road to heaven — out of a state of wrath under sin into a state of grace, the sinner's conduct under grace

his struggles and victory — this is what this well-known book aims to be. Starting from the premises of universal human depravity and universal grace and redemption, it presents the means of grace in their efficacy and effects, declining misconceptions and misinterpretations of the Lutheran teaching at every point. The ways of the Lutheran Church — infant baptism, the teaching of the Catechism, confirmation, preparatory services before Communion, opposition to the revival method, etc., are explained. The damnation of unbaptized infants, which the author implies p. 32, he declines p. 49. In his presentation of conversion we observe the same peculiarities noted on a former occasion, though in a less pronounced form. The very heading of chap. 20, "Human Agency in Conversion," is an unhappy terminology. It is begotten of the fear that, unless a human agency in, not before, conversion is assured, conversion is by irresistible grace. To overcome this difficulty, prevenient grace is introduced, "which precedes or goes before all other movements in the return of the soul to God." "After prevenient grace begins to make itself felt, then the will begins to take part. It must now assume an attitude, and meet the question: Shall I yield to these holy influences or not? One or the other of two courses must be pursued. There must be a yielding to the heavenly strivings or a resistance. To resist at this point requires a positive act of the will. This act man can put forth by his own strength. On the other hand, with the help of that grace already at work in his heart he can refuse to put forth that act of his will, and thus remain non-resistant." (p. 171 f.) This view is defective, 1) because it does not accomplish what it seeks to accomplish: it does not remove "irresistible" grace. For the question arises at once: How does man receive "prevenient" grace? He cannot receive it by his *natural* powers of intellect and will, for he is spiritually dead. He cannot receive it by *communicated* divine power; for none has been communicated; "prevenient" grace is "the first movement," and this "must always be from God to the sinner, not from the sinner to God." (p. 169.) If the author remains true to his premises: universal and complete human depravity and the monergism of divine grace in the quickening of new life in the sinner, — and we believe that he means to be true to these fundamental truths, — it is not possible for him to avoid teaching at this point the very thing which he rejects in others, "irresistible" grace. There is no getting over this difficulty for the author except by his dropping his premises, or admitting that "the first movement" is by what he and others would call "irresistible" grace. It is a pathetic infatuation which is observable at this point in many theologians otherwise sound in doctrine: they seem to be unable to grasp these two facts that the grace which converts the sinner is resistible, and yet converts. Man's natural powers are exerted against "prevenient" grace just as they are exerted against grace called by any other name. How converting grace, which is always resistible grace, actually converts, that is the mystery. It is the only proper thing for a theologian to do at this point: acknowledge the inexplicableness of the spiritual phenomenon, and not attempt an explanation which does not explain. 2) The author's view creates new difficulties in the place of the one which it seeks to remove: a) If

the sinner has accepted "prevenient" grace, what is his spiritual status before he has made that choice of which the author speaks, *viz.*, yielding to the holy influences or not? Is he still in his old natural state under sin? Evidently not; for he has "prevenient" grace, which he did not have before. Is he a child of God? Evidently not; for he has not decided as yet that he will be. He is a spiritual nondescript, whom neither God nor the devil can claim. What becomes of him if he dies while still dwelling in this soteriological No Man's Land? God cannot condemn him because he has "the first movement" and the "holy influences." He is not a finished product of divine grace, but no Christian is that at his death. Neither can God save him; for the person has not reached a decision. b) "Prevenient" grace, as the author views it, proposes an alternative to the sinner: Either you resist, or you do not resist. If it does that, either course ought to be regarded as the effect resulting from "prevenient" grace. In other words, the sinner ought to be viewed as acting under "prevenient" grace both when non-resistant and when resistant. This view the author himself repudiates: he refers resistance to the sinner's "own strength." However, if that is the case, the sinner by resisting does something which "prevenient" grace does not suggest to him, and for which it does not enable him. The sinner requires no enabling for his resistance; he has the power by nature. Consequently, "prevenient" grace does not propose a choice, an alternative. It can only propose acceptance, if it proposes anything. In other words, it can only propose to the sinner to take a stand against his former self, or out of a person unwilling to accept the Gospel become a willing one. c) Is the sinner's acceptance of the Gospel wrought by any other power than "prevenient" grace? by anything that is not grace? This is what the author seems to indicate when he speaks of "prevenient" grace as "helping." In that case, however, conversion is the joint product of grace and something that is not grace, and the author contradicts his own citation from the Form of Concord, p. 169, which declares that "in spiritual and divine things" man has no power. d) "Prevenient" grace, in the author's view, effects not conversion, but non-resistance. It should now be shown whether non-resistance is conversion, is tantamount to having accepted the offer of the Gospel, or whether it is a condition of moral indecision. This is what the author plainly intends. In that case, however, "prevenient" grace produces a halting doubter. e) This whole process is foreign to the experience of converted sinners. When they speak of their conversion, they speak of it in the terms of Paul: The Holy Spirit turned me from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God; or of Luther: "I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, my Lord, or come to Him, but the Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel, enlightened me with His gifts"; or of the blind man in the Gospel: "One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see" (John 9, 25). The converted sinner views his own conversion as a miracle for which he has no explanation. He knows the fact, but not the manner of it. The author's elaborate process from spiritual death to a nondescript state under "prevenient" grace, thence to the attitude of deliberation,

thence to non-resistance, thence — perhaps — to conversion is an artificial psychological process of which the Scriptures and the common Christian experience know nothing. It is the sad heritage of seventeenth-century dogmatics, of which our Church had better rid itself the sooner, the better.

*The Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa:—*

1. *MARTIN OF MANSFELD*. By Margaret R. Seebach. X and 223 pages. 18 illustrations.
2. *DOCTOR LUTHER*. By Gustav Freytag. Translated by G. C. L. Riemer, Ph. D. 203 pages. 6 illustrations.

Two lives of Luther, the latter an acknowledged classic of German literature, the former destined to become the English classic in the field of Luther biographies for young people, are here offered — a splendid contribution to the anniversary literature which this year of the Reformation Jubilee has called forth. Freytag's work is too well known to require further comment. The translator has been faithful to the original. Mrs. Seebach's book is a delight from cover to cover. With perfect fidelity to historical facts she tells Luther's life with the charm of a good story. She does not talk about Luther and the people who are mentioned in her book, but she makes them talk and act.

The *Milwaukee Hospital*, "*The Passavant*," has issued an artistic Annual Report for the years 1915 and 1916.

*Charles Scribner's Sons, New York:—*

*LIFE OF LUTHER* by Julius Koestlin. With (59) illustrations from authentic sources. 587 pages; \$1.00. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This is a very serviceable translation of Koestlin's smaller Life of Luther, which for a generation has been the favorite Life for laymen who do not care to go into the deep theological questions which Koestlin touches upon in his larger Life of Luther in two bulky volumes. The book is divided in six parts: Part I: Luther's childhood and youth, up to his entering the convent, 1483—1505. Part II: Luther as monk and professor, until his entry on the war of Reformation, 1505—1507. Part III: The breach with Rome up to the Diet of Worms, 1517—1521. Part IV: From the Diet of Worms to the Peasants' War and Luther's marriage, 1521—1525. Part V: Luther and the reconstruction of the Church to the First Religious Peace, 1525—1532. Part VI: From the Religious Peace of Nuremberg to the death of Luther, 1532—1546.

*Sherman, French & Co., Boston:—*

1. *THE VALIDITY OF THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE*. A Preliminary Study in the Philosophy of Religion. By George A. Barrow, Ph. D. XI and 247 pages; \$1.50.

Assuming "experience" to be "anything which may be the object of a man's consciousness," the author proceeds to investigate whether

there is such a thing as an experience of religion, which he affirms from known facts of observation. It is interesting to the theologian in view of the discussion on "irresistible" grace to hear a philosopher say: "It is a question whether a man experiences his own purposes, or his own will. The question might be put in the form as to whether there can be a subjective experience. Ordinarily the assumption would be that there could not. What a man experiences, though it may come to him from his own body or even his 'subconscious life,' is usually assumed to be something over whose coming, or at least over the complete determination of whose coming, he does not have control." (p. 7.) The relation of religion to self-consciousness is discussed, also whether religion is related to physical forces. The experience of religion is examined as to its reality, and it is found to be unique. It has validity, but is distinct from other experiences. It is, therefore, the study of a separate "science," the science of theology, or of religion. The treatise does not concern itself with the teaching of the Scripture, but studies on the basis of philosophical principles the phenomenon of religion.

2. *DOUBTERS AND THEIR DOUBTS.* By Charles David Darling, Ph. D. 117 pages; \$1.10.

To the person who must wrestle with skepticism, either in himself or in others, the nine chapters in this book offer an appreciable aid. The opening chapter ("A Plea for the Honest Doubter") justifies the book, which deals with these four principal subjects: God (chap. 2), the Scriptures (chaps. 3 and 8), Christ (chaps. 4, 6, and 9), Christianity (chaps. 5 and 7), and the future life (chap. 9). The discourse is animated, replete with forceful appeals and illuminating illustrations, and pulsating with generous sympathy for the unfortunate doubter. Occasionally oratorical efforts are given a little too much space in comparison to calm argument, which, after all, must do the work in any effort to liberate a skeptic. Such efforts, too, lead to false emphasis; *e. g.*, we believe the author could have obtained better inscriptions for the two flags which he nails to the masts of the Bible from Matt. 11, 28 and 2 Tim. 3, 15—17.

3. *The Hibbert Journal* for January presents the following contributions: National Training: the Moral Equivalent for War, by Harold Begbie; Enforcing Peace, by Edward M. Chapman; Is International Government Possible? by J. A. Hobson; Democracy and Compulsory Service, by G. G. Coulton; French Nationalism, by Dr. H. A. L. Fisher; Sacramental Religion, by the Bishop of Carlisle; The Originality and Finality of Christian Ethics, by Prof. H. H. Scullard; The Festival of Lives Given for the Nation in Jewish and Christian Faith, by Prof. B. W. Bacon; Proclus as Constructive Philosopher, by Rev. J. Lindsay, D. D.; Stumbling-blocks, by Mrs. A. C. Osler; Religious Beliefs in American Colleges, by Prof. Carl Holliday; Is Liberty an Adequate Ideal of State Action? by Rev. H. Clark, D. D.; Discussion and Book Review.

4. *The Hibbert Journal* for April presents the following articles: Science is one of the Humanities, by Prof. J. B. Bailey; Punishment and Reconstruction, by L. P. Jacks; After Twenty-five years

(study of the occult), by Sir Oliver Lodge; America's Self-revelation, by Prof. Hartley B. Alexander; National Hate, by A. D. McLaren; Drudgery and Education, by Edmond Holmes; The Religious Philosophy of Vladimir Solovyov, by Mrs. J. N. Duddington; Five New Religious Cults in British New Guinea, by E. W. P. Chinnery and A. C. Haddon; Force and the Conquest of Evil in Christian Ethics, by G. F. Barbour; The Love which is Not the Fulfilling of the Law, by Constance L. Maynard; National Training, by Rev. Reginald F. Rynd. The department of "Discussions" contains communications on "Sacramental Religion," "National Training," and "The Modernist Revival of Anglicanism."

*Harper and Brothers, New York:—*

1. *ACRES OF DIAMONDS*. By *Russell H. Conwell*. His Life and Achievements by *Robert Shackleton*. With an autobiographical note. 183 pages.

Some of our readers may have heard this address of the President of Temple University, Philadelphia. It is here given in the most recent and complete form. *Acres of Diamonds* is a spirited plea to develop resources nearest to you instead of going abroad to discover resources, and to regard service, devotion to duty, the test of true greatness. The author devoted his earnings as a lecturer to providing the support of students at college.

2. *THE OTHER WISE MAN*. By *Henry Van Dyke*. 75 pages.

The author's fancy depicts for us the fourth of the Magi who went to Bethlehem to worship the Christ. He misses connection with the other three because he is delayed by ministering to a dying Jew outside of Babylon. When he arrives at Bethlehem, the flight into Egypt has already taken place. He goes to Egypt, looking for Christ, but fails to find Him or any trace of Him. After about thirty-three years of wandering he finds himself at Jerusalem during the Passover, and is told of the impending crucifixion of the Galilean prophet. On the way to Golgotha he is again delayed by an act of mercy: he ransoms a woman about to be sold into slavery with his last treasure. During this transaction the eclipse occurs, accompanied by an earthquake. A tile is loosened from a roof, which kills him. A voice from heaven is heard as he dies pronouncing him a good and faithful servant. He had remained outside of the conventional connection of religious people with Christ, and yet was accepted by God as His own. That is the lesson conveyed, and the reader can easily draw his own conclusions.

*Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, Mass.:—*

- MARTIN LUTHER*. The Story of His Life. By *Elsie Singmaster*. 138 pages; \$1.

This "popular life" of Martin Luther, written by the daughter of a Lutheran clergyman, is an acceptable contribution to the literature of the anniversary of the Reformation. It is written in good plain

English; the style is easy and pleasing, and the story moves along rapidly, touching the essential points in Luther's eventful life. It is chiefly the young Luther and the Luther of the early stage of the reformatory movement that is here depicted. Young people, and such as are unprepared to enter into an exhaustive study of Luther's writing, will be delighted with this little biography of the Reformer.

*The Standard Publishing Company, Cincinnati:—*

**THE BLACK PROPHET.** By *Guy Fitch Phelps*. 360 pages; \$1.35.

Though making use of facts of history, this book is entirely fiction. It belongs in the class of "reform novels." It aims at a portrayal of the inner life of Catholicism. A sincere priest learns the inconsistencies and the unscriptural character of the teaching of Rome. His thwarted love of a wealthy young lady who enters a convent furnishes another motive for his opposition to his superior. The last chapters impress one as unreal, and spoil the effect. Rome will, no doubt, group this novel with the *Maria Monk* and kindred stories, declare herself grossly slandered and persecuted, and receive another martyr's crown from people who do not discriminate between truth and fiction, and possess little spiritual knowledge.

*George H. Doran Co., New York:—*

**THE CONSTRUCTIVE QUARTERLY** for March, 1917 (Vol. V, No. 1), contains the following contributions: *The Church*, by W. P. DuBose, M. A., S. T. D.; *Church Union*, by the Most Rev. H. L. Clarke, D. D., D. C. L.; *Augustine's Vision of Unity*, by Mgr. Ratiffol, Litt. D.; *The Three Universalities*, by A. E. Garvie, M. A., D. D.; *Orthodox Russia and Its Orthodox Priesthood*, by N. N. Glubokovsky; *Our Spiritual Perils as Neutrals*, by the Most Rev. N. Soederblom, D. D.; *Mysticism in the French Church*, by W. L. Bevan, Ph. D.; *The Permanent Meaning of Propitiation*, by C. C. J. Webb, M. A.; *Something about the Study of the Bible*, by H. T. Obbink; *A Factor in World Fellowship*, by F. E. Clark, D. D., LL. D.; *The Heresy that Hinders*, by E. T. Root; *Samuel Butler the Third*, by M. Acklom, M. A.

*The Journal of Negro History*, edited by *Carter G. Woodson* (41 North Queen St., Lancaster, Pa.), now running in its second year, is a promising quarterly devoted to the study of the African freedmen in America. The number for January offers the following articles: *The African Slave-trade*, by *Jerome Dowd*; *The Negro in the Field of Invention*, by *H. E. Baker*; *Anthony Benezet*, by the editor; *People of Color in Louisiana*, by *Alice Dunbar-Nelson*; *Notes on Connecticut as a Slave State*; *Letters of Anthony Benezet*; *Book Review and Notes*.  
D.